

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 11, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Ross W. Dye, Church of Christ, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God.—Psalm 42: 1.

Our Father, we pray that we may recognize our inadequacies and know that the only answer to our need is the living God. We invoke Thy guidance upon the Members of this body that they may frame wise and just laws designed to provide for the welfare of all citizens. Imbue each of us with not only the long view of history but also with an awareness of eternity. May we desire to be Thy servants, and grant us wisdom for our tasks. We pray that men and nations may lay aside their ancient hatreds and dwell in peace. Give us clear views of personal and national goals, and supply the strength that no just cause shall ultimately fail. In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 24, 1967:

H.R. 6133. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6431. An act to amend the public health laws relating to mental health to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9029. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

On June 26, 1967:

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of Cecil A. Rhodes; and

H.R. 2048. An act for the relief of William John Masterton and Louis Vincent Nanne.

On June 28, 1967:

H.R. 834. An act to amend section 5 of the act of February 11, 1929, to remove the dollar limit on the authority of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims of the District of Columbia in escheat cases;

H.R. 4445. An act for the relief of Aurex Corp.;

H.R. 4717. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn.; and

H.J. Res. 601. Joint resolution extending for 4 months the emergency provisions of the urban mass transportation program.

On June 29, 1967:

H.R. 4880. An act to extend the time within which certain requests may be filed under

the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965; and

H.R. 10943. An act to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965. On June 30, 1967:

H.R. 5424. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard;

H.R. 10867. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1967:

H.R. 10730. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions.

On July 3, 1967:

H.R. 5615. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap.

On July 7, 1967:

H.R. 1516. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tocco;

H.R. 1703. An act for the relief of Angiolina Condello;

H.R. 1763. An act for the relief of Dr. Raul E. Bertran;

H.R. 1764. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernesto M. Campello;

H.R. 1765. An act for the relief of Dr. Ubaldo Gregorio Catasus-Rodriguez;

H.R. 3349. An act to continue until the close of September 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of nickel;

H.R. 3523. An act for the relief of Chang-You Wu, M.D.;

H.R. 3652. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1970, the existing suspension of duties on manganese ore (including ferruginous ore) and related products;

H.R. 4241. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H.R. 4930. An act for the relief of Mr. Robert A. Owen;

H.R. 5702. An act to remove the 5-acre limitation on the amount of tobacco allotment acreage which may be leased;

H.R. 7501. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8265. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2762. An act for the relief of CWO Bernhard Vollmer, U.S. Navy (retired).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10368. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 10368) entitled "An act

making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship; and

S. 1111. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 68-1.

PELLEY APPLAUDS HOUSE DISCUSSION OF PEACE PROPOSAL

Mr. PELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have called for a full debate by this body on the question of the war in Vietnam. Yesterday we witnessed the closest thing to a debate on this issue when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] along with a number of our colleagues presented a policy of "staged deescalation" to end the Vietnam war.

On June 5 I raised the question before this House on whether or not constructive alternatives have been available and proposed within our Government and outside it at each stage in the escalation of the Vietnam conflict. All policies of Government need alternatives which can be readily available, and especially policies concerned with warfare. The gentlemen who spoke yesterday deserve the thanks of the Nation for coming forth with the constructive alternatives to a difficult situation. I was also happy to hear our distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT] take an interest in the proposals put forth yesterday by our eight colleagues.

Along the same lines, Mr. Speaker, I was delighted that a number of Members of Congress spoke up against the intervention of the administration in the present rebellion in the Congo. The token intervention approval by the President was completely ill advised.

Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine recently wrote:

Sons, fathers, brothers, husbands are dying today. Ask yourself why. Give yourself the answer—if you can. Let's have the "guts" to make up for our own mistakes—let's not make that unborn babe pay our bills, fight our wars, furnish our food and housing. Let's wipe the ingratiating grins off the faces of the warmongers and political spendthrifts who "paint the picture" with colors we have never seen.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to applaud the Members of the House who took part in yesterday's discussion of a proposal to bring about peace. The House at long last is showing signs of constructive and constitutional responsibility in debating the Vietnam issue.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENDING THE LIFE OF THE COMMISSION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 853) to extend the life of the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on June 19 the extension of the life of this Commission on Political Activity was before the House, under the Consent Calendar, and certain questions were asked at that time. The information was not then available.

It was pointed out that the Commission on Political Activity had failed in an early start, because of the failure to appoint all of the Commissioners for nearly 3 months. Questions as to what progress had been made were not answered at that time.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the report has been made available. This is a simple extension in order to complete the business of the Commission. I understand the cost will be less than or at least no more than an additional \$25,000.

I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary would advise us further as to what progress has been made in the Commission's original aims and objectives, and whether it has made any progress.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman or to any other Member who has this information.

Mr. ASHMORE. I notice the gentleman who is a member of the Commission is present in the Chamber. I am sure he could give a better report as to what the Commission has done than I.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the response of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. The committee, of course, has met and organized, and a staff has been engaged to carry on the work of the Commission.

Hearings have been held in various parts of the country.

We seek to determine whether or not there should be greater liberalization of the Hatch Act. Frankly, there is a disagreement in the committee to some degree as to what the objectives ought to be.

I feel, as a member of the Commission, that there should be some investigation of the violations of the Hatch Act in order to determine where the act should be tightened up, to eliminate political activity.

This seems to be glossed over, and I am very disappointed about that. However, there are areas where there needs to be some clarification as to penalties and other phases of the Hatch Act. I think that we will get things straightened out and finally come up with a good report. I have not attended all of the meetings myself but have attended enough so that I do feel we will bring this thing out in pretty good shape before we get done.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the appropriation for this will be allowed.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the gentleman an additional question. I think, as per his last sentence, that he does hope this bill will be allowed for the limited extension of the Commission so that we can have further funding and additional staff and complete the writing of the report. What would you expect to happen as a result of the writing of the report? Would you expect the people in the military services, for example, to be encouraged to read beyond the first page of the existing Hatch Act which tells them what not to do and to read into the second and third pages which tells them what their rights are as citizens and their responsibilities thereunder?

Mr. NELSEN. My feelings are—and the hearings developed this—that the Federal employees and the military are unaware of what they can and what they cannot do under existing law. We have suggested to the Civil Service Commission that more information be made available to the Federal employees so that they know what they can and cannot do. I think this is important, but it has been pointed out to me that the Civil Service Commission has been limited in what they can do because of the limited appropriations available to them. I think there is some merit to that observation.

Mr. HALL. I will say further to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate his responses and certainly appreciate his being on the Commission. I am very familiar with the work he has done in certain administrative agencies and departments where they "bug" the employees for political contributions, in direct violation of the Hatch Act. I hope that the Commission will further emphasize and develop, under his natural leadership and membership on this Commission, these phases. This might be emphasized as well as the rights of all the citizens and Government employees—or others—in exercising their franchise to select as well as elect good representatives in our representative republic.

Mr. NELSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. NELSEN. I would like to point out in the hearings early I made it very clear that I thought not only should we investigate the possibility of some liberalization in some areas, but I also felt it was necessary that we provide some enforcement machinery where there were violations. I also feel there should have been some thorough investigation as to violations so that we might understand the extent to which it has occurred. There have been fundraising dinners where Federal employees have been pressured to purchase tickets. Yet this seems to be sort of shoved aside and there seems to be a desire of some to look toward liberalization and not toward a tightening of the enforcement side. I hope before we are through we can get at it. I have asked that counsel be provided for some of these investigations. So far my request has not been honored.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, in the opinion of the gentleman, if he believes that there will be proper coordination with this body's new Committee on Standards and Ethics, and the subcommittee of House of Representatives administration—as far as campaign funds, the declaration of intent, disclosure, and any other standards of ethics and conduct as far as the members of the Government and this Congress are concerned?

Mr. NELSEN. I am sure there will be. I must say in the Commission there are some very, very competent men and some outstanding persons. I think you will find on the Commission itself, whether they be Republican or Democrat, that there is a unanimity of feeling that moves in the direction I have suggested. I am sure when we are through we will be pleased with the report we have to offer.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman feel that the delay in the appointment of the Commission, originally, is what is primarily responsible for the need for an extension of time and additional moneys?

Mr. NELSEN. Without question that is true.

Mr. HALL. This is rather expensive, but in view of the statements of the gentleman and the reaction in the weeks since this first came up, I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NELSEN. Thank you.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone why, since President Johnson signed this legislation on October 3, 1966, the members of the Commission were not appointed until the following January 26? The bill plainly specified that the Commission should report within 1 year. In other words, on October 3 of this year. Can anyone shed any light on the intriguing question of why the President delayed from October 3, 1966, to January 26, 1967, to appoint members of the Commission?

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I do not know that I can specifically answer the question, but I would like to point out to the gentle-

man from Iowa that it is my recollection the act was passed late in the session and actually I think that the time for reporting should have been at a different time. However, there was not enough time for a commission to get into operation in order to make a report within the limitations of the language of the act itself.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is about the best answer I could give to the gentleman from Iowa. However, it is my further opinion that there has also been some delay as to the appointment of a Commission. But, perhaps, we are as much in error on our side on this question as others are on the other side of the aisle, where the names have not been suggested to fill these positions.

Mr. GROSS. Well, there is not very much economy involved when the delay necessitates an additional expenditure of \$25,000.

Mr. Speaker, this amount of money would supply a substantial amount of light at the White House.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, I would agree with the gentleman that we could buy a lot of electricity for \$25,000.

Mr. GROSS. It seems very, very strange to me that the President of the United States could not appoint the members of this Commission during the time from October 3, 1966, until January 26, this year.

I wonder how much has been expended by this Commission to date? Does the gentleman have any idea as to how much has been expended by the Commission so far?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. There has been obligated, as of July 1, \$110,000.

Mr. GROSS. And, now, you want another \$25,000 to complete this study. You will not be back here asking for more money as a result of the procrastination at the White House; is that correct?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we do not anticipate asking for a further extension.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, but before doing so I submit for printing in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the July 5, 1967, issue of the Waterloo, Iowa, Courier which deals with the strange action of the Civil Service Commission and Department of Justice in the case of a Federal employee who was held to have violated the Hatch Act. I suggest that the Commission scrutinize the handling of this case.

The editorial follows:

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT FAILS TO BACK HATCH ACT VERDICT

A man by the name of Robert E. Hobart of Concord, N.H., is a member of the Postal Clerks Union and part-time secretary-treasurer of the New Hampshire AFL-CIO.

According to the union newspaper, "The Machinist," "As part of his duties for the state labor body, Hobart mailed out (during the 1964 campaign) a pamphlet, 'Right Wing Takes Over a Major Political Party.' The pamphlet included a report on right-wing activities at the Republican National Convention and was published by Group Re-

search Reports, an organization which keeps tabs on extreme groups."

For this political activity, the Civil Service Commission suspended Hobart for 30 days for violation of the Hatch Act and as a result he lost \$674.62 in pay. But the AFL-CIO associate counsel appealed to the Court of Claims on behalf of Hobart.

The Justice Department failed to defend the case in any way and Hobart was awarded back pay.

In answer to an inquiry from Rep. H. R. Gross, R., Iowa, Acting Assistant Attorney General Carl Eardley declared:

"The department's analysis of the litigation factors in the Hobart case produced the conclusions that it was not a typical Hatch Act case, that any defense would, of necessity, raise Constitutional issues, and that it would be a wholly unattractive test vehicle upon which to premise a major court battle over the Constitutionality of the Hatch Act."

Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, declared in a letter to Gross: "In short, a settlement of the case which cost the government less than \$700 (repayment of 30 days' pay to Mr. Hobart), constituted the most considerate defense of the statute under the circumstances."

Thus, the Civil Service Commission, after finding Hobart guilty of violating the Hatch Act by administrative order, refused with the Justice Department to defend its position in court.

The whole concept of the Hatch Act is that civil servants are protected against political discharge and in return are denied the right to engage directly in partisan politics except for private discussions with friends and voting at elections.

It is the function of the Civil Service Commission and the Justice Department to enforce this concept of the law and they were, in our opinion, grossly negligent in refusing to defend the original administrative order.

The U.S. Supreme Court found the Hatch Act Constitutional in 1947; but it often reverses itself according to the personal views of the justices. But a reversal in this case would disastrously undermine the civil service concept and would soon result in government by the government rather than government by the people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 853

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 7(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to create a bipartisan commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government", approved October 3, 1966 (80 Stat. 868), is amended to read as follows: "The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the President and to the Congress on or before December 31, 1967, and upon the filing of the report, the Commission shall cease to exist."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 2733 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10482) to amend section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of claimant's contributory negligence, to

clarify the procedure for appeal from certain claims determinations, and to limit the amount of attorney fees thereunder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] as to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as I view this bill, at the present time under the Tort Claims Act, the doctrine of comparative negligence would apply only if a State has the doctrine of comparative negligence; is that true?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is true. It is also what this bill, if enacted, would provide as to the Military Claims Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. So, what this bill provides is with respect to the liability of the Military Establishment for tort claims, and that in enforcing a claim, if a State has a doctrine of comparative negligence, you would pay based upon that doctrine; is that correct?

Mr. ASHMORE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. It is my judgment based upon a reading of the bill—or, rather, a reading of the report that you do not know what the additional cost will be involved by reason of, let us say, liberalizing our tort claims laws insofar as the Federal Government is concerned and insofar as our Military Establishment is concerned?

The gentleman does not know how much it would cost the Government if we so liberalized the law?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I will state to the gentleman that there is no way, based upon our hearings and the information which we had presented to us, to predict what the estimated or the exact cost would be, because we do not know how many cases there will be, as a matter of fact. But it, primarily, provides for greater fairness toward all people who might have claims against the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I read from Report No. 377, page 6 thereof, the following:

Only clause (1) of the bill would have some increased budgetary impact.

A realistic estimate, however, is not possible as this proposal would apply only to accidents arising in areas where the doctrine of comparative negligence applies, and where the application of the Federal Tort Claims Act and the Foreign Claims Act is not involved. The bulk of the claims would be for property damage resulting from traffic accidents involving U.S. vehicles and private vehicles of U.S. nationals in foreign countries. In the past, the number and amounts of these claims have not been large—and of course we anticipate they would not be large in the future. Clause (2) would result in considerable savings to the Government in the cost of administration and processing of appeals.

It was the opinion of the subcommittee that the cost would not be very much more than what it is at the present time.

As we say in the report, and as you

and I realize, no one knows how many accidents are going to happen in some foreign land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know how many States in the Union apply the doctrine of comparative negligence?

Mr. ASHMORE. I could not answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Does the committee have an answer in its files?

Mr. ASHMORE. I do not believe that we have the precise number. Some States, of course, have the doctrine of contributory negligence as a complete bar to a claim, and I believe that the doctrine of comparative negligence is followed in approximately 10 States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. If this bill passes, will the Federal Government then involve its several departments in embracing the doctrine of comparative negligence fully and completely?

Mr. ASHMORE. I am sorry. Would the gentleman repeat his last question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Yes. I was just wondering: We apparently have the doctrine of comparative negligence in the ordinary Federal Tort Claims Act, and we will now be extending it to the military.

Mr. ASHMORE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. And inasmuch as it will apply to all military establishments, then I presume it will prevail abroad if we have an accident abroad?

Mr. ASHMORE. It would under this act; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Are there any other departments or any other parts of the Federal Government now where you have involved and do embrace the doctrine of comparative negligence?

Mr. ASHMORE. Not that I am aware of beyond those administering the statutes cited in the committee report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I would state to the gentleman from South Carolina the reason I am asking him the questions is that when I was in the Pennsylvania Legislature we considered adopting the rule of comparative negligence for our great State, and the evidence showed it would cost a tremendous amount of money to do away with the doctrine of contributory negligence and adopt the doctrine of comparative negligence.

However, if the gentleman says it is not going to cost the Federal Government very much money, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ASHMORE. I am convinced it would not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10482

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in place thereof "or, if so caused, allowed only to the extent that the law of the

place where the act or omission complained of occurred would permit recovery from a private individual under like circumstances; and";

(2) striking out the period at the end of subsection (g) and inserting in place thereof the following: ", subject to appeal to the Secretary concerned, or his designee for that purpose."; and

(3) adding a new subsection (h) to read: "(h) No attorney shall charge, demand, receive, or collect for services rendered, fees in excess of 10 per centum of any award or settlement under this section. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall, if recovery be had, be fined not more than \$2,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, lines 7 through 13, strike the language of lines 7 through 13 on page 2 of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of claimant's contributory negligence, and to clarify the procedure for appeal from certain claims determinations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on General Education of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISAPPROVAL OF U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONGO

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, while not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I want to associate myself with those who are critical of President Johnson's sending of military planes and personnel to the Congo these last 2 days. I believe it is unwise to directly intervene in the tempestuous, unstable boiling pot of unsettled, restless, darkest Africa. The United States is already overextended. We ought not to invite further foreign involvements in this way at this time.

More particularly, this ought not to be done without the prior approval and authorization of the Congress of the United States. Telephone consultation with a few Senators is not enough. Congress is not a rubberstamp for any President, whatever his political party.

Although the conduct of foreign affairs is undeniably entrusted by the Constitution to the executive branch, when such conduct can lead to war by extensive predictable involvement of men and equipment it ought not to be undertaken without advance deliberation and approval of the Congress. Accordingly, I have today introduced a resolution of disapproval of this latest foreign involvement in the Congo. I would offer such a resolution whether the administration were Republican or Democrat. The United States can no longer afford the risk of one-man involvement in war of this entire Nation.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day set for the call of the Private Calendar.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

E. F. FORT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2661) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEMETRIOS KONSTANTINOS GEORGARAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1596) for the relief of Demetrios Konstantinos Georgaras (also known as James K. Georgaras).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PUGET SOUND PLYWOOD, INC., OF TACOMA, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4949) for the relief of Puget Sound Plywood, Inc., of Tacoma, Wash.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ANTONINA RONDINELLI ASCI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1564) for the relief of Antonina Rondinelli Asci.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1564

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of sections 203(a)(2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Antonina Rondinelli Asci shall be held and considered to be the natural born daughter of Alfred A. and Francesca A. Asci, citizens of the United States: Provided, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonina Rondinelli Asci may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Alfred A. Asci, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided, That the brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLOS ROGELIO FLORES-VASQUEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2036) for the relief of Carlos Rogelio Flores-Vasquez.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MRS. INGE HEMMERSBACH HILTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6096) for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CAPT. REY D. BALDWIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 95) for the relief of Capt. Rey D. Baldwin.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

JESSE C. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 324) for the relief of Jesse C. Johnson.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MRS. MARY T. BROOKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 371) for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Brooks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 371

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Public Printer is authorized and directed to pay out of the revolving fund of the Government Printing Office the sum of \$742.40, representing salary due Mrs. Mary T. Brooks, an employee of the Government Printing Office, for the period January 13, 1966, through February 26, 1966, when she was separated from her employment due to the erroneous notification by the Civil Service Commission of approval of her application for disability retirement. After tax withholding, payment of group life and health insurance premiums, and deductions of amounts due the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, the balance of the amount hereby appropriated shall be paid to Mrs. Brooks in full settlement of any and all claims against the United States arising out of her erroneous separation, and the period January 13, 1966, through February 26, 1966, shall be deemed a period of creditable Federal service by Mrs. Brooks for retirement and related purposes. The Public Printer is further authorized and directed to pay out of the cited revolving fund the agency contributions for retirement, life insurance, and health benefits purposes which would have been required by law had Mrs. Brooks been in paid employment during the period of her erroneous separation.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHIN SHEE SHIU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 636) for the relief of Mrs. Chin Shee Shiu.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

T. SGT. ANTHONY J. CORSO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 650) for the relief of T. Sgt. Anthony J. Corso, U.S. Air Force (retired).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 650

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Technical Sergeant Anthony J. Corso, United States Air Force (retired), is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$468.86, representing the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by the said Technical Sergeant Anthony J. Corso, for the period between April 1, 1950, and January 7, 1963, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Technical Sergeant Anthony J. Corso, referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amount received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHMORE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: On page 2, line 8, insert:

"No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 652) for the relief of certain employees of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 652

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each of the following named persons is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount which appears beside his name:

Rita L. Burdick, \$604.00; Frederick R. Bixler, \$910.07; Roland A. Bastrom, \$105.60; R. C. Boyce, \$593.71.

Each such amount is the amount of overpayments, arising out of an administrative error, of his salary as a civilian employee of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard during the years 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appro-

priated, to each person named in the first section of this Act an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to his indebtedness to the United States specified in such section.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES H. THURSTON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 819) for the relief of Charles H. Thurston.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 819

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Charles H. Thurston of Macon, Georgia, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$905.08, representing overpayments of salary which he received as an employee of the Department of the Air Force at Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, for the period from September 3, 1963, through July 17, 1965, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error in determining the rate of basic compensation to which the said Charles H. Thurston was entitled when he was changed from grade GS-9 to grade GS-7, effective September 3, 1963, due to the abolishment of his former position. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Charles H. Thurston the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WARREN F. COLEMAN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 985) for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 985

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That Warren F. Coleman, Junior, an employee of the Department of the Air Force, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States the sum of \$1,253.07, representing the amount of overpayments of salary received by the said Warren F. Coleman, Junior, for the period from July 10, 1955, through February 24, 1962, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Warren F. Coleman, Junior, referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHMORE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: On page 2, line 8, insert:

"No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALTON R. CONNER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1045) for the relief of Alton R. Conner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1045

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Alton R. Conner, of Warner Robins, Georgia, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$736.46, representing overpayments of salary which he received as an employee of the Department of the Air Force at Warner Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, for the period from June 8, 1958, through February 23, 1963, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Alton R. Conner, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS M. SCANLON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1537) for the relief of Thomas M. Scanlon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1537

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Thomas M. Scanlon, of 1131 Chalet Avenue, New Carlisle, Ohio, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$268, representing the balance of a salary advance which the United States Air Force failed to withhold from his pay and allowances at his direction prior to his discharge. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OMER PENNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1653) for the relief of Omer Penner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1653

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of the war claims fund, to Omer Penner, 1924 Cabrillo Street, San Francisco, California, the amount certified to him under section 2 of this Act. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Omer Penner against the United States for detention benefits under section 5(a) through 5(e) of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended by the War Claims Act Amendments of 1954: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

SEC. 2. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall promptly determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount which would have been payable to Omer Penner as detention benefits under section 5(a) through 5(e) of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended by the War Claims Act Amendments of 1954, if Omer Penner had filed a claim therefor within the period prescribed by law.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 1, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARA B. HYSSONG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1655) for the relief of Clara B. Hyssong.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

FRANK I. MELLIN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1674) for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MRS. LESSIE EDWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1680) for the relief of Mrs. Lessie Edwards.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

OUR LADY OF PILLAR CATHOLIC CHURCH, SANTA ANA, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1894) for the relief of Our Lady of Pillar Catholic Church in Santa Ana, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1894

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Our Lady of Pillar Catholic Church in Santa Ana, California, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$505.80, representing its liability to the United States because of an inadvertent violation of a restriction regarding the use of donated property which Our Lady of Pillar Catholic Church received under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 5, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILDREN OF MRS. DORIS E. WARREN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2454) for the relief of the children of Mrs. Doris E. Warren.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

COMDR. ALBERT G. BERRY, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2757) for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

IKE IGNAC KLEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3474) to require the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to determine the amount and validity of the claim of Ike Ignac Klein against the Government of Hungary, and for other purposes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MAURITZ A. STERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3865) for the relief of Mauritz A. Sterner.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

T. MICHAEL SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4015) for the relief of T. Michael Smith.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TO CONVEY PROPERTY IN PENNSYLVANIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4833) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4833

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to convey to Mr. Ralph J. Litchard, rural delivery numbered 1, Montgomery, Pennsylvania, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the 0.262 acre tract of land described in section 2 of this Act and owned by the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, upon payment to the United States by or on behalf of Ralph J. Litchard of the fair market value of the United States portion (as determined by the Attorney General).

SEC. 2. The 0.262 acre tract of land referred to in the first section of this Act is described as follows: Beginning at a point along the western side of United States Route 15 approximately 10 miles south of the city of Williamsport, Pennsylvania, and is bordered on the south by land of Ralph J. Litchard and on the west and north by land of United States Bureau of Prisons. Land markings begin at an iron pipe on the western right-of-way line on Route 15; said iron pipe being opposite the first culvert under Route 15, north of Litchard's Motel; thence from iron pipe marking north twenty-seven degrees thirty minutes east a distance of 129.75 feet to a second iron pipe marking; thence north sixty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes west a distance of 175.85 feet to a third iron pipe marking; thence south thirty-one degrees fifty minutes east a distance of 199.80 feet to the first iron pipe marking the place of beginning on Route 15, adjacent to Litchard's Motel property. This property described contains 0.262 acre, presently belonging to the Northeast United States Federal Prison Camp.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 21, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3. In conveying the tract hereinbefore referred to, the Attorney General may vary from the description stated: *Provided*, That the total area actually conveyed by him shall not exceed 0.500 acre (½ acre)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HAZEL M. LaFRANCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5025) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of Mrs. Hazel M. LaFrance against the United States.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ALBERT P. MORELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5967) for the relief of Albert P. Morell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5967

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum

of \$954.67 to Albert P. Morell, of Dunmore, Pennsylvania, in full settlement of his claims for funeral and burial expenses rendered in connection with the funeral of the late Nunziata Lalli which were not paid due to the fact that the principal assets of the decedent consisting of three \$1,000 and two \$500 series E savings bonds were made payable upon death to the United States and were not, therefore, available for the payment of necessary and proper funeral and burial expenses. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed upon receipt of the United States savings bonds of series E totaling \$4,000 (face value), numbered D-32876574-E, D-30831656-E, M-30623497-E, M-30623498-E, and M-30623499-E, outstanding on the books of the Treasury Department, registered in the name of Nunziata Lalli, 610 North Washington Avenue, Scranton, Pennsylvania, payable on death to the Treasurer or the Treasury Department of the United States, or upon receipt of evidence satisfactory to him establishing their loss, together with evidence of the death of Nunziata Lalli, so that redemption of the bonds is effected, to apply the proceeds, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay not in excess of the sum of \$954.67 to Albert P. Morell of Dunmore, Pennsylvania, to the extent judicially determined, or otherwise established to the satisfaction of the Secretary, in full settlement of his claims with respect to funeral and burial services rendered in connection with the funeral of the late Nunziata Lalli which were not paid due to the fact that the principal assets of the decedent consisted of the aforesaid bonds, and were not, therefore, available for the payment of necessary and proper funeral and burial expenses. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWIFF-TRAIN CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6004) for the relief of Swiff-Train Co.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FRED W. KOLB, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6189) for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

JOHN A. DANISCH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6324) for the relief of John A. Danisch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6324

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of July 31, 1956, as amended (70 Stat. 743, Eighty-fourth Congress), the period of time served by John A. Danisch with the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (I.C.E.M.), a public international organization, from April 15, 1952, to February 9, 1954, shall be held and considered to be creditable Federal service for retirement purposes.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 6 and 7; strike "Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (I.C.E.M.)" and insert "Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe (PICMME)".

On page 2 line 1, strike "creditable Federal service" and insert "leave without pay from Federal employment".

On page 2 after line 2, add new section 2, as follows:

"SEC. 2. The limitations of section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to benefits payable on the basis of the provisions of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN E. COPLIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6452) for the relief of John E. Coplin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bills, as follows:

H.R. 6452

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any limitation of time with respect to application for, or payment of, reimbursement of expenses incident to the shipment of Federal employees' household effects incident to change of duty station, the claim of John E. Coplin, an employee of the Department of Agriculture, for shipment of his household effects from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Chicago, Illinois, shall be deemed to have been timely filed and shall be considered and acted upon in accordance with applicable law and regulations if such claim is filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALGONAC MANUFACTURING CO. AND JOHN A. MAXWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6462) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of the Algonac Manufacturing Co. and John A. Maxwell against the United States.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

JESSE W. STUTTS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6663) for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6663

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Jesse W. Stutts, Junior, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$1,294.40, representing the aggregate amount of overpayment of compensation received by him during the period beginning April 8, 1963, and ending May 29, 1965, both dates inclusive, as an employee of the Department of the Army at Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, due to an administrative error which occurred without fault on his part. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jesse W. Stutts, Junior, the sum certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Secretary of the Army as the aggregate of amounts paid to the United States by Jesse W. Stutts, Junior (including amounts withheld by the United States from amounts otherwise due him), on account of the liability for which relief is granted by the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 12, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SLATOR C. BLACKISTON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6862) for the relief of Slator C. Blackiston, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6862

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Slaton C. Blackiston, Junior, an employee of the Foreign Service of the United States, the sum of \$9,515.73 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal property lost while performing his official duties. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. EMANUEL MARCUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7599) for the relief of Dr. Emanuel Marcus.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RICHARD ALAN WHITE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7811) for the relief of Richard Alan White.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7811

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of subchapter III (relating to civil service retirement) of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, Richard Alan White shall be held and considered to be the adopted son of Benny R. White, deceased former employee of the Rural Electrification Administration, United States Department of Agriculture. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. Section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to annuity benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8091) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EDDIE GARMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8485) for the relief of Eddie Garman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8485

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eddie Garman, of Mill Creek, Pennsylvania, the sum of \$897.30. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Eddie Garman for a death gratuity payment on account of the death of his brother, who was killed in action in Korea on September 19, 1951, while serving in the Army. The payment of such claim by the Secretary of the Army is barred by the provisions of the Act of October 9, 1940 (31 U.S.C. 71a), which imposes a ten-year limitation of time on the payment of claims against the United States. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 4, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR L. ASHLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10414) for the relief of Victor L. Ashley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10414

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Victor L. Ashley, of Green Cove Springs, Florida, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$3,708.80, representing an overpayment of compensation from January 27, 1957, through October 1, 1961, received by him while employed with the Florida group, Atlantic Reserve Fleet, Green Cove Springs, Florida. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Victor L. Ashley an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed

guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATHANASIA ARGERE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 39) for the relief of Athanasia Argere.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DR. OTON SOCARRAZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 60) for the relief of Dr. Oton Socarraz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 60

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Oton Socarraz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 13, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JUAN RAMON DIAZ ZAYAS BAZAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 67) for the relief of Dr. Juan Ramon Diaz Zayas Bazan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 67

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Juan Ramon Diaz Zayas Bazan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 16, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ALBERTO FERNANDEZ-BRAVO Y AMAT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 132) for the relief of Dr. Alberto Fernandez-Bravo y Amat.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 132

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Alberto Fernandez-Bravo y Amat shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 3, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. CESAR A. MENA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 164) for the relief of Dr. Cesar A. Mena.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 164

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Cesar A. Mena shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 11, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA JORDAN FERRANDO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 168) for the relief of Maria Jordan Ferrando.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 168

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Maria Jordan Ferrando shall be held and considered to be the parent of Mrs. Victoria Trabue, a citizen of the United States, within the meaning of section 201(b) of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSA ANNA GENOVESE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 256) for the relief of Rosa Anna Genovese.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ROSA AGOSTINO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 280) for the relief of Rosa Agostino.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DR. CARLOS VICTOR DE LA CONCEPCION GARCIA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 327) for the relief of Dr. Carlos Victor De La Concepcion Garcia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 327

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Carlos Victor De La Concepcion Garcia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 1, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JESUS L. LASTRA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 462) for the relief of Dr. Jesus L. Lastra.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 462

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Jesus L. Lastra shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 6, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. GUILLERMO N. HERNANDEZ, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 464) for the relief of Dr. Guillermo N. Hernandez, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 464

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Guillermo N. Hernandez, Junior, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 31, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MARIO GUILLERMO MARTINEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 465) for the relief of Dr. Mario Guillermo Martinez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 465

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Mario Guillermo Martinez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 17, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MANUEL A. ZUNIGA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 499) for the relief of Dr. Manuel A. Zuniga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 499

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Manuel A. Zuniga shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 18, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOREEN DELMEGE WILLIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 904) for the relief of Doreen Delmege Willis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 904

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the periods of time Doreen Delmege Willis has resided and was physically present in the United States or any State since August 2, 1952, shall be held and considered as compliance with the residence and physical presence requirement of section 316 of said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUIS TAPIA DAVILA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 906) for the relief of Luis Tapia Davila.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 906

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Luis Tapia Davila shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 12, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "That", insert the following: ", for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ESTHER YOLANDA LAUZARDO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 996) for the relief of Dr. Esther Yolanda Lauzardo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 996

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Esther Yolanda Lauzardo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States

for permanent residence as of August 21, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. AMPARO CASTRO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 118) for the relief of Dr. Amparo Castro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 118

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Amparo Castro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 1, 1958.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETSUKO WILSON (NEE HIRANAKA)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 534) for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HYE SUK PAENG AND MI KUNG PAENG (PATRICIA ANN)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 822) for the relief of Hye Suk Paeng and Mi Kung Paeng (Patricia Ann).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DR. FLORIBERTO S. PUENTE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1278) for the relief of Dr. Floriberto S. Puente.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1278

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Floriberto S. Puente shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 3, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELISABETA HORWATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2485) for the relief of Elisabeta Horwath.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RAMIRO VELASQUEZ HUERTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3497) for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TERESINA FARA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4159) for the relief of Teresina Fara.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DR. JOHN E. YANNAKAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4538) for the relief of Dr. John E. Yannakakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4538

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John E. Yannakakis, doctor of medicine, shall be held and considered to have complied with the requirements of section 316 of that Act as they relate to residence and physical presence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERTO MARTIN DEL CAMPO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5216) for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

DR. BERNARDINO D. MARCELO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5996) for the relief of Dr. Bernardino D. Marcello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5996

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Bernardino D. Marcelo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully

admitted for permanent residence as of December 28, 1956.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAN DROBOT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8254) for the relief of Jan Drobot.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FEDERICO DE LA CRUZ-MUNOZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9080) for the relief of Federico de la Cruz-Munoz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9080

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Federico de la Cruz-Munoz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 28, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DEMETRIA MESSANA BARONE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1820) for the relief of Mrs. Demetria Messana Barone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1820

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Demetria Messana Barone shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Demetria Messana Barone. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Demetria Messana Barone shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the annual report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal year 1966.

This report shows clearly the progress that is being made toward our goal of economic equality for rural America.

Farm surpluses have virtually been eliminated. With the removal of this threat to farm prices, farm income has been strengthened.

Yet the elimination of surpluses poses a new dilemma:

On the one hand, national and world needs demand a high level of production of food and fiber. With populations soaring and the margin of food supplies growing thinner in many areas of the world, we cannot gamble on the possibility of inadequate stocks.

On the other hand, farmers who produce supplies in excess of immediate requirements as a national precaution, cannot be expected to bear the cost themselves through depressed farm prices and income.

To increase price protection for farmers in these new circumstances, the Commodity Credit Corporation has recently expanded its price-support loan program.

The price-support loan program has long provided farmers protection against commodity price reductions. Under the program, farmers are able to obtain loans at harvesttime, enabling them to withhold their products from the markets until later in the marketing season when prices are more favorable. Loans for this purpose totaled nearly \$2 billion in fiscal 1966.

The expansion of the price-support loan program will permit more farmers to keep commodities off the market beyond the current crop season. The commodities will continue to be owned by the farmers, with the Government paying the storage costs as part of the Nation's price for maintaining adequate reserves.

By thus drawing further upon the resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation to meet changing conditions,

this Nation will be taking another important step toward economic equality for the American farmer.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 11, 1967.

TWELFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES FOR RETIRED SERVICEMAN'S FAMILY PROTECTION PLAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 12th Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries for the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan.

This plan, which was adopted in 1953, allows retired servicemen to elect reduced pay so that their widows and children can receive survivor benefits. At the end of 1965, the year covered by this report, more than 67,000 retired servicemen were participating in this program and about 5,000 families were receiving its benefits.

I commend this report to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 11, 1967.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 162]

Adair	Flood	Meeds
Ashley	Foley	Miller, Calif.
Baring	Friedel	Monagan
Berry	Grover	Moore
Bevill	Hagan	Moorhead
Blackburn	Hansen, Idaho	Morgan
Brock	Hansen, Wash.	Moss
Burton, Utah	Hathaway	Murphy, N.Y.
Clawson, Del.	Hébert	O'Hara, Mich.
Collier	Hungate	O'Konski
Conable	Karth	O'Neal, Ga.
Daddario	King, Calif.	Pepper
Dent	Kyl	Purcell
Diggs	Leggett	Rees
Dingell	McClure	Reifel
Dwyer	McDade	Reinecke
Feighan	McEwen	Reuss
Fino	Martin	Rostenkowski

St Germain	Stephens	Watson
St. Onge	Taft	Wilson
Shipley	Tuck	Charles H.
Smith, N.Y.	Tunney	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF THE U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10805) to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10805

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 104(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, as amended (78 Stat. 251; 42 U.S.C. 1975c (b)), is further amended by deleting the words "January 31, 1968", and substituting therefor the words "January 31, 1973".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 10805, extends the existence of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission for a period of 5 years, which is from January 31, 1968, to January 31, 1973. In his recent message, the President has recommended the extension of the Commission for 5 years. The Department of Justice has likewise supported the extension of the Commission.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is an independent, bipartisan agency which, on the recommendation of then President Eisenhower, was first established in 1957 and then extended by the Congress at various times. It is not a law-enforcement or prosecuting agency; it acts primarily and solely as a factfinding and research agency. In 1964, Congress expanded the scope of its duties to serve as a clearinghouse for information on the problem of civil rights throughout the Nation. The members of the Commission are all distinguished, dedicated gentlemen, all devoted to maintenance of civil rights.

In each of the States, including the District of Columbia, there are advisory committees to assist the Commission in gathering and disseminating information about civil rights problems. It has conducted conferences on local as well as on a national basis on many problems affecting civil rights. In the past, most of the work of the Commission has been centered on what was the major problem in the field of civil rights—that in the South. However, it is now planned to

broaden its work, and I may say it has already started to broaden it to the problems which exist in other parts of this country. For example, hearings have been held by the Commission in many cities throughout the Nation—in New York, Chicago, Washington, New Orleans, and Boston.

The Commission has now undertaken studies on a variety of new issues which require this extension. The program in the past has emphasized the denial of civil rights to Negroes in the South, but currently the Commission has launched a similar program of factfinding and research into the urban civil rights problems, with emphasis on the North. It has broadened its scope beyond just the hard-core civil rights problems so as to include examinations of the more complex problems of civil rights and possible solutions.

The Commission has undertaken the examination of the problems faced by the American Indian and the Mexican-American in the denial of civil rights. These are areas of civil rights which need to be examined and assessed in order to point up the need for legislation.

The Commission performs a very useful function as the only independent agency which can examine the impact of the various Federal programs and Federal activity affecting the problem of civil rights. It has studied on a local and State level the activities in federally assisted programs, thus, appraising the Federal laws and policies in order to be determined whether they are being effectively implemented.

The reports of the Commission have been widely published and circulated and have received the approval of most of the experts in this field.

This bill will in no way affect the basic authority which prior legislation has conferred on the Commission. It is specifically authorized to investigate complaints that citizens are being denied their right to vote by reason of their race, religion, color, or national origin. It is authorized to investigate allegations of vote fraud, to study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, or national origin, including the administration of justice, to appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to the denial of equal protection of the laws, and, finally, to serve as a national clearinghouse for civil rights legislation.

Despite the fact that the Commission's limited authorization—normally for 2 years—has in the past presented it with the problem of maintaining continuity of its program and its staff, the Commission has performed its work and performed it well. I believe that it should be relieved of the problem of attempting to maintain an adequate staff and a long-range, effective program. This bill is designed to do that very thing.

As I have stated earlier, there are many problems which need to be analyzed and appraised. The enactment of this bill will do that very thing. It is the only agency in our Government which can do it and, therefore, I believe this legislation should be enacted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have been very much intrigued in reading the report accompanying the bill to note that 99 percent of the report is dedicated to a departmental report. Does the committee have no views on this legislation that ought to be stated in this report? I tell the gentleman frankly that I have never seen a report quite like it. The panel report refers to a gentleman by the name of William L. Taylor, who is not otherwise identified. Who is William L. Taylor?

Mr. CELLER. I will say to the gentleman that William L. Taylor is the staff director. In addition thereto, the statements made in the report reflect the views of the committee. The vote in the committee was unanimous. There was no dissenting vote with reference to this bill. We feel that the bill is very meritorious. The Commission has been established in a Republican administration and has carried on through a Democratic administration. It is a purely bipartisan agency, and I do hope the gentleman from Iowa will consider it in that light.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I would have appreciated something in the report attempting to justify the continuance of this Commission. I see nothing in the report to justify a continuance at a cost of some \$2,600,000 a year except a self-serving statement on the part of a member of the staff of the Commission.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman was probably inattentive to what I said in my statement, which gave some idea of what the Commission is doing. If the gentleman would want me to, I would be very glad to give him a copy of my statement. In addition to that, the President of the United States in his message covered the subject rather well and pervasively. If the gentleman will look at the President's message, which is the House document, he will see some very cogent reasons why we should extend the life of this Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, based upon what I can read—and, certainly, I cannot obtain any information from this report, on the basis of reading a report that is written by a staff member of the Commission itself—I say again that it is self-serving.

Mr. Speaker, if this Commission has accomplished anything by way of stopping riots, by way of doing anything to protect the civil rights of all the people of this country, I know nothing about it. In my opinion the Commission is an aggregation of payroll straphangers.

Mr. CELLER. That may be the gentleman's opinion. But it is an opinion that is not shared by the rank and file of the people of this Nation. The President does not share that point of view; the Department of Justice does not share that point of view; the members of the Committee on the Judiciary do not share that point of view and I would further state to the gentleman from Iowa it is my opinion that a preponderant number of the Members of this House will not share that point of view.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I noticed in the press over the past weekend that this Commission is having a difficult time keeping members and personnel; that there has been quite a number of resignations of directors and members of the Commission itself. Also that there has been a tremendous number of resignations and quite a turnover in the personnel of the Commission.

Can the gentleman from New York give us any information as to the reason for this?

Mr. CELLER. The period heretofore of extension was only for 2 years and it made it difficult for the Commission to maintain good personnel, and it made it very difficult to recruit new personnel which had to be paid. It is for that reason that we are asking that the extension be for a period beyond the 2 years as recommended by the President; namely, 5 years.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New York will yield further, I gathered from that press report that the Commission was facing a great difficulty in finding something to do; that it was having to make work for itself with little or no work suggested for it by people around the country; and, that they were having all kinds of problems in finding new fields of so-called rights violations, thus indicating it is serving a useless function.

Mr. CELLER. It is my opinion that the gentleman would find that they primarily addressed themselves to situations in the South. They are now spreading into other sections of the country and particularly into the North and into a number of metropolitan areas of the North which need the attention of such a Commission as this.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the press report indicated that these people went out of their way to locate civil rights violations, and that it was just simply difficult for the Commission to find something to do. I think that is about the situation.

Mr. CELLER. The hearings held before the Appropriations Committee seemed to indicate a vast number of complaints with reference to voting, covering almost every State of the Union.

The gentleman from Mississippi will find that information on page 269 of the hearings which were held before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Justice and Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does this Commission have any authority to look into the riots that have been visited upon the country, the destruction of property and the violation of local laws and so on that have been incidental to these riots?

Mr. CELLER. I should think that it has that authority where there is involved a denial of civil rights.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Could we expect

that they might look into those situations?

Mr. CELLER. I do not know whether we could expect anything like that or not. I do not know whether they intend to do that or whether they expect to work for the Director in other fields. I cannot say. But the inquiry the gentleman has made is a very sound one.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There is really not a genuine need for the continuance of this Commission, is there? Is it not a most useless and unnecessary thing?

Mr. CELLER. I believe there is, because there is a continuing deprivation of civil rights in the North, in the West, and in the East, not only in the part of the country the gentleman comes from, but in my own part also, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I note in the committee report on page 2 in item 2, under No. 1, Commission Functions, that it says: "Investigate allegations of vote fraud."

I assume that that refers to the power to investigate under section 104, paragraph 5, which the Commission has under the 1957 act to investigate allegations made in writing under oath or affirmation that citizens of the United States are unlawfully being prevented from or being denied the right to vote, or to have their vote counted in any national elections involving the election of Members of the Senate or the House or other Federal elections, and so forth. I assume that that is what section 2 refers to?

Mr. CELLER. I believe the gentleman should add further that it was at the gentleman's suggestion that the amendment was offered and agreed to successfully. It is the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for that observation. However, my continuing interest is in inquiring whether or not the gentleman has any information as to whether that has been effectuated, and in fact whether the Commission is going to go into further vote fraud cases as directed by the Congress—and this of course relates to vote fraud and the right of everyone to vote, and have their votes properly counted, meaning people in the majority as well as in the minority.

Mr. CELLER. I can say in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman that there have been over 1,139 complaints of vote fraud on the basis of voting rights coming from practically every State in the Union. Apparently the Commission has addressed itself to some of these complaints. Some of these complaints were sworn to and some were not sworn to. They cover general irregularities concerning voting, particularly in civil rights. Now, I cannot give the gentleman information as to how far the Commission went or how deeply they went into this particular question, but apparently they are addressing themselves to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from New York has consumed 16 minutes; the gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the Speaker for directing my attention to that fact.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and also, of course, the motion to suspend the rules.

As the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has reported, this legislation was initially recommended in the Eisenhower administration, and the life of the Commission has been extended four times. Regretfully, there were some interims between the extensions of the life of the Commission by reason of the slow action of the Congress. It is hoped that this legislation will be passed today, and by an overwhelming vote, so that the Commission and the employees will fully realize that this Commission has the support of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning of the Commission the members thereof were people of great ability and great standing in this country. Today, the Chairman of the Commission is Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University. The Vice President is Eugene C. Patterson, an official with the Atlanta Constitution.

Dr. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, is a member of the Commission and has been a member of the Commission for most of the time since its inception.

Dr. Erwin N. Griswold, Harvard University Law School, is a member of this Commission.

Robert S. Rankin, professor of political science at Duke University, is a member of this Commission.

Mrs. Frankie Muse Freeman, an official of the St. Louis Housing Authority, is a member of this Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it has been asked: What has the Commission done? I am pleased to report to the House of Representatives that numerous studies have been made by the Commission in various parts of the country including the State of Ohio and particularly in Cleveland, Ohio. We now have some information as to why we had the riots in Cleveland that were so disastrous to the people up there.

One of my colleagues will speak at some length on these reports and will bring some of the tangible evidence to the House for its view and I shall not dwell upon it longer.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think the overwhelming evidence furnished by this Commission and by the staff since 1957 shows that it has been performing a useful public service every day of its life and that its life should be extended for 5 years.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be a permanent Commission, because the problem of civil rights is a continuing one.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman for one question.

Mr. WAGGONER. I wonder if the gentleman would care to tell the House, since he will only yield for one question—

what the studies of the Civil Rights Commission finally say were the causes of the riots in his native State of Ohio?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am sorry I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. WAGGONER. Would the gentleman mind telling the House, since the Civil Rights Commission has now conducted an investigation of a sort into the problems of civil rights in Cleveland and in Ohio, what they have found the cause of the demonstrations and riots and violence in Cleveland to be?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Of course, the official findings on the immediate causes of those riots are contained in the report of the grand jury which investigated that case.

In addition to those findings, the Civil Rights Commission found that we had neglected the education of some of the youth in Cleveland and that we did not satisfy the housing needs of the people there.

Mr. WAGGONER. Would the gentleman yield for just one further question?

Mr. McCULLOCH. In further answer to the gentleman's question, it has been suggested by an alert staff member that the Cleveland riots had as their immediate cause professional agitators who were sent there from other States in the Union.

Let me quote briefly from the grand jury report:

"It was established before the jury that the leaders of the W.E.B. DuBois Club and the Communist Youth Party, with interchangeable officers and virtually identical concepts, arrived in Cleveland only a few days before the Hough area disorders. They took up residence at 1844 East 81st Street, only a short distance from the central point of origin of the Hough area troubles.

"These men, who came from Chicago, New York and Brooklyn, were Mike Bayer, otherwise known as Mike Davidow, Daniel Mack, Ronald Lucas and Steve Shreeter. They were seen constantly together. They made swift contact with the JFK (Jomo Freedom Kenyatta House, headquarters for the rioters) House leadership, and with Phil Bart of Middlehurst Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio, and his wife, Connie, who, the evidence showed, are the leaders of the Communist Party throughout the Ohio Valley district, including Cleveland."

Hard on the heels of this report, the UPI quoted Stokely Carmichael from New York as saying, "In Cleveland they're building stores with no windows—all brick. I don't know what they think they'll accomplish. It just means we have to move from Molotov cocktails to dynamite."

Mr. WAGGONER. Does the gentleman mean the same type of agitators who have been going into the South have been going into Cleveland?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do not know the names of all the people who have been going into the South. I am speaking only as to what the record shows up there. In any event, whether they go into the South or not, when they are violating the law, they should be punished. When they are interfering with the rights of citizens of this country and using the highways and the streets and the byways to do so and when they are engaging in riots in violation of the law, they should be punished.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for stating his thoughts on this situation which does concern all the Members of this House of Representatives.

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission, has not nor ever will be able to come up with the precise reasons for the riots in the distinguished gentleman's State or in my State or anywhere else. A reading of the transcript of the Cleveland hearings of the Commission in April 1966 reveals that the Commission's investigation found serious problems of inadequate housing, education, job opportunities, health and welfare programs, and a very poor state of police-community relations. In fact, these serious problems seem to have been the precipitating factors in the riots in the Hough area which occurred a few months after the Commission's Cleveland hearings.

None of the many investigations by the Civil Rights Commission throughout America has ever found that the riots which so trouble us all actually were caused by professional agitators sent there from other States of the Union. It would be a wonderful thing, I suppose, if that were true, because it would then be so easy to eliminate these riots. But the riots are not caused by malevolent travelers who go from place to place but are instead caused by the system of degradation and discrimination that occurs in so many places throughout America.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has done an excellent service for America by exploring and analyzing the true causes of these riots and bringing them to the attention of the Congress and the American people. As long as we focus on the statements and activities of a few colorful and flamboyant figures as the causes, these riots will certainly continue. Only if we focus on the true causes do we have any hope of developing effective answers and solutions.

I think it would certainly be helpful if the American people and the Congress would begin to appreciate the extreme sense of frustration that is felt in the ghettos of America which is the basic and underlying cause of these riots.

As the gentleman from Ohio has so correctly pointed out these riots are caused by the serious problems that have existed—and over several generations—in the racial ghettos of America of slum housing, unemployment, poor education, totally inadequate welfare programs, and the whole system of racial discrimination. These interrelated set of problems have resulted in poverty being inherited from one generation to the next. The riots are caused by the great and increasing frustration and despair felt by millions of Americans who are trapped in this inherited poverty and degradation.

The Commission on Civil Rights has always taken the true and constructive approach of analyzing the basic causes of these riots as the only effective answer. This is just part of the Commission's overall vital and important role in focusing the attention of America on the prob-

lems of civil rights which the gentlemen from Ohio so correctly stated are continuing problems.

I want to strongly second and support the statement of the distinguished ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee, that the Civil Rights Commission should be made a permanent agency of our Government. I very much regret that the Judiciary Committee was not able to bring out a bill to this House which would have given the Commission permanent status.

I doubt that any Member of this House is ready to assure us that the problem of assuring equal opportunity to every American will be solved this year, next year, or even in the 5 years for which this Commission's life is being extended.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], our colleague on the Judiciary Committee, for his contribution.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLOY].

Mr. McCLOY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to support the gentleman from Ohio in his statement and to state that in my opinion the Civil Rights Commission is a most useful agency in connection with the long-range problem of civil rights. It would be a mistake for this body not to recognize that civil rights problems will be with us for a long time. We need the Civil Rights Commission as a forum before which civil rights problems can be brought, where they can be discussed, and where reliable, factual information can be gathered for the benefit of the Nation, and particularly for the benefit of the Congress.

From the committee meetings, from the report, and from the statements that have been made on the floor today I would conclude that this is the most useful agency which we can have in connection with the problem of civil rights.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the gentleman from Illinois. Is it not a fact that some of the most effective legislation which the Judiciary Committee has approved and the Congress has passed came from recommendations made by the Commission, such as the Voting Rights Act of 1965?

Mr. McCLOY. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee, has long been identified with legislation which has helped to establish and to continue the life of the Civil Rights Commission. So I am particularly happy to be associated with him in supporting this legislation today. I would be happier, as I am sure he would be happier, if this were a bill which would make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent Commission. But I think that we can support the bill in good conscience today, in view of the fact that this is a substantial extension of the life of the Commission, and that

after the expiration of 5 years of new life which we will provide, there will be a further opportunity to make it a permanent Commission.

I say that it ought to be a permanent Commission because it deals with the civil rights of everyone. Because of the nature of the problems that have plagued our society in the last few years there is the tendency to believe that civil rights are solely connected with racial tensions. But this is not so.

As my distinguished colleague from Florida mentioned a few moments ago, there are civil rights related to the right to vote. That is a civil rights problem. It has nothing to do with race as such, or it need have nothing to do with race. This should be a problem with which the Commission should concern itself.

Civil rights are rights that every American has. They are rights to do something—the right to be educated, the right to vote, the right to be represented in this House, and many other civil rights which all of us have. They do not necessarily have a racial connotation. But civil rights are rights which every American has. These are rights which the Commission is constantly supervising. The purpose of the Commission is to find facts.

I believe the Commission has done a superb job of finding facts. In the course of its existence, it has published some very distinguished reports. They are reports which cover broad areas. They are reports which committee counsel has at the table. They are reports which have been of great help to the Judiciary Committee in the discharge of its legislative responsibilities.

Again, these reports are not related solely to the rights of one group of Americans, but to the rights of all Americans. As our society grows—and, I hope, improves and prospers—different kinds of civil rights problems may be presented from those which are in the forefront today. This is why I believe we need a continuing Civil Rights Commission, one that will watch over these rights and one that will relate to Congress the problems of the day so that we can legislate effectively in these areas.

At this point I would like to offer an article that appeared in this morning's Washington Post. The article is as follows:

U.S. RIGHTS UNIT CITES POLITICAL BIAS IN SOUTH

(By David S. Broder)

A year-long investigation by the Federal Civil Rights Commission has found evidence of "numerous incidents" of discrimination against Negroes by both political parties in the South, a Commission official said yesterday.

William L. Taylor, the Commission's staff director disclosed in an interview the preliminary results of its investigation of political practices in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina and Tennessee.

"Problems of discrimination of one kind or another were found in most of the states," he said.

The most widespread complaints were directed at both Democratic and Republican parties, Taylor said. These concerned the absence of Negroes among the official primary and general election-day poll workers and the failure of local party officials to give

adequate notice and publicity to party caucuses and conventions.

DIRECTED AT DEMOCRATS

Aside from these general problems, Taylor said, specific complaints about exclusion of Negroes from party processes were directed almost exclusively against the Democrats, still dominant at the local level in the eight states the Commission investigated.

The only allegation of discrimination against a Republican official concerned the action by county GOP committee in one state which rejected a Negro candidate's filing papers for the State Legislature. The county committee's action was reversed by the State Republican executive committee in that instance, Taylor said.

But Taylor said there were "numerous incidents," ranging from direct intimidation to subtle forms of discrimination, involving complaints against local and state Democratic officials in the eight Southern States.

A special equal rights committee of the Democratic National Committee is scheduled to meet here Wednesday to discuss guarantees against discrimination in the selection of delegates to the 1968 national convention.

FORMED IN 1964

The special committee was formed in the aftermath of the 1964 convention controversy over the predominantly Negro Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party's challenge to the seating of the Mississippi delegation. It has a mandate from the 1964 convention to "assure that voters in (every) state, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin, have the opportunity to participate fully in party affairs . . ."

Gov. Richard J. Hughes (D-N.J.) took over chairmanship of the committee earlier this year after the death of its original chairman, former Gov. David L. Lawrence of Pennsylvania. The committee is expected to begin drawing up guidelines Wednesday for specific standards that the state parties will have to meet in order to have their delegates accepted in 1968.

Taylor said the Commission investigation findings would be made available, on request, to officials of both Republican and Democratic parties. The Republican party has no specific rule on non-discrimination and no panel comparable to the Hughes committee.

According to the staff director, the Civil Rights Commission launched its investigation after receiving several complaints that newly registered Negro voters and would-be Negro candidates were finding discrimination from party officials in the South in their effort to join party activities.

Taylor noted that the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which led to a spurt in Negro registration in Southern states, extended its guarantees against discrimination to "all action necessary to make a vote effective in any primary, special, or general election . . . with respect to candidates for public or party office."

Investigators for the Commission, under general counsel Howard Glickstein and attorney Frank Parker, interviewed Negro complainants, civil rights leaders and officials of both parties in 30 counties in the eight states during the past 12 months, Taylor said.

The staff's findings and recommendations will be submitted to the Commission and then reported sometime next fall, Taylor said. There are no current plans for public hearings in the South.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman from Maryland probably knows, there was a riot in Waterloo, Iowa, my home city, during the

last weekend, reportedly because of an invasion of professional agitators from Detroit, Mich.

Since the gentleman is so sold on the Commission's ability to dispense rights to others regardless of race, creed, color, or other condition of servitude, what are the rights of the merchants and others whose properties were the targets of Molotov cocktails, rocks, and other devices for destruction? What are their rights?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my distinguished friend from Iowa that his constituents of Waterloo, Iowa, have very basic rights in this situation, rights that I believe will be better protected if we have the Civil Rights Commission looking into instances of disturbances, looking into the reasons behind these riots, bringing to the attention of the Congress the problems that exist. If there are wrongs being perpetrated, the Commission will find out what they are.

I believe the gentleman from Iowa will agree with me that if we can surface these problems, if we can see who is at fault, and what is at fault, and if we can discern the answers, there will be fewer riots in Waterloo, Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to give a partial answer to the question of my colleague from Iowa.

Of course, those unlawful acts—if any there were in Waterloo—and I am not denying them; I am saying if there were unlawful acts in Waterloo, they are proscribed by the laws of the State of Iowa. Complaints may be filed against the transgressors or, if they be certain offenses, the transgressors may be indicted by the grand jury if the facts warrant indictment, and they may be brought to trial.

Furthermore, I am happy to say to my friend from Iowa, there is likely to come onto the floor for debate and vote this week the antiriot legislation, which passed this body in 1966, which would proscribe the movement of people in and out of interstate commerce in fomenting and inciting and organizing riots.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield for one question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if we are to depend on State law in the State of Iowa—and I hope the reliance will be upon the State law, for God help the people of my State if they must rely on the Federal arm of government—if we are going to do that, then why have a Civil Rights Commission, the only accomplishment of which has been to spend several millions of dollars?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yielded for one question, and my answer to the question of my good friend from Iowa is the same answer that goes for the legislation that proscribed auto-

mobile theft in interstate commerce, interstate activities in prostitution, and in kidnapping, and the like.

Furthermore, in few if any Federal laws have we assumed jurisdiction, at the loss of any State. It is supplemental legislation.

If Iowa, Ohio, or Louisiana should fail to enforce criminal laws, such failure would be primarily the fault of the officials and the citizens of those respective States.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10805.

The gentleman from Iowa just alluded to "condition of servitude" in discussing the fields of concern of the Civil Rights Commission.

I am pleased to report that the 13th amendment to the Constitution has ended that particular problem, and the Commission does not have to grapple with it.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is an independent, bipartisan agency established by the Congress under the Civil Rights Act of 1957. The Department of Justice earlier this year reaffirmed "the valuable contribution of the Commission to our understanding of racial problems in diverse areas," and strongly urged the importance of permitting the Commission to continue its work.

The Commission's sole function, from the beginning, has been to find facts—to identify the areas where inequities exist and equal opportunity is denied, and to report these facts to the President, the Congress, and the Nation. It is not charged with enforcement powers of civil rights laws.

In 1964, we extended the Commission until January 1968. Because of this additional grant of time, the Commission has been able to undertake a variety of studies that would not have otherwise been possible. The Commission has been able to plan for long-range projects and more comprehensive programs. The 5-year extension, as provided in this legislation, will enable the Commission to continue to its optimum worth.

I urge passage of H.R. 10805 as being in the best interest of the Nation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER].

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question or two of the chairman of the committee on the report, which is, as the gentleman from Iowa says, largely a personal opinion of a single staff member of the Civil Rights Commission.

Dealing with one of the reports, which the Commission during its existence has issued, there is listed the report on "Racial Isolation in Public Schools in 1967."

Is this not the particular report wherein the Civil Rights Commission chose to recommend reform of the school systems of northern Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, and recommended a reorganization of these schools and busing students between two

sovereign States and the District of Columbia to achieve their version of racial balance in schools?

Mr. CELLER. I cannot answer that question, because I do not recall exactly what were the recommendations. I have the volume here. Given time, probably I could answer.

I am sorry I cannot give the gentleman an adequate answer at the moment.

Mr. WAGGONER. Can the gentleman recall one instance of a study or a report which has been issued by the Civil Rights Commission which was not predicated upon race? We speak of other civil rights, but has the Civil Rights Commission issued a report on any other basis?

Mr. CELLER. I do not know of any. I can say this, though, in reply to the gentleman's question: there was a report on law enforcement with reference to civil rights, called the "Report on Equal Protection in the South." I know the gentleman is familiar with that. That certainly impinged very directly on civil rights and constitutional rights, beyond question.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman in his initial statement set forth the possibility that in the future work of the Commission it would conduct particular investigations in the North. Does this constitute an admission on the part of the Civil Rights Commission and others who are concerned that there is a need because of existing discrimination for the Civil Rights Commission to expand its activities out of the South?

Mr. CELLER. I would be the last man in the world to say there is no discrimination based on race, color, or creed in the North. I would say we have that discrimination in my own bailiwick, Brooklyn, N.Y., in New York State, and in many other States of the North. Certainly the Civil Rights Commission should direct attention to it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Louisiana, that the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights made a study and issued a report in 1966 entitled "Children in Need."

"Children in Need." That has no reference to race, as such, but to poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGREGOR].

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is unusual in this body when every member of a subcommittee joins in sponsoring the same item of legislation. H.R. 10805, the bill to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 5 years, is sponsored by all seven of the Democrats and by all six of the Republicans serving on Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary. As we approach a vote on this matter it is important to understand the limited authority and powers of the Civil Rights Commission, because, as the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary just said, primarily it is a factfinding body. This is a body that seeks to facilitate the transmission of information on a problem or a series of problems or a whole family or area of problems of vital concern to all Americans, regardless of the color of

their skin or the circumstances of their birth. It also makes recommendations. Those recommendations in and of themselves will not affect the school system of northern Virginia. Those recommendations in and of themselves will not solve the problem of riots in Waterloo, Iowa, or anywhere else. But Mr. Speaker, if Congress has a serious weakness today it lies in having an insufficient factual foundation of knowledge on current problems so as to legislate intelligently. No one in this body need accept any of the recommendations or conclusions of the Civil Rights Commission. Each of us, however, can benefit from the factfinding function of this committee, headed as it is by such a distinguished educator and administrator as the president of Michigan State University and including in its membership Father Hesburgh of Notre Dame University and the other distinguished members listed by the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I just want to call the attention of the House to the sheer weight of the volumes that have been produced in recent months and years by the Civil Rights Commission.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield further to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to point out these volumes include reports on education, employment, housing, justice, a general report on civil rights, the hearings in Cleveland, Ohio, the hearings on the administration of justice, the report on law enforcement, the report on public education and on racial isolation in public schools, just to name a few outstanding examples of the factfinding function of the Commission.

I think our friend from Iowa expects too much of this Commission. What it does is find facts.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I am glad that the gentleman from Maryland mentioned the reports with respect to the State of Ohio, because this reminds me of the fact that the Civil Rights Commission has in turn spawned citizen advisory committees in virtually all of our States. Much of its work in Ohio recently is a direct result of the initiative of the citizens advisory committee of that State.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, when the Civil Rights Commission was created in 1957, it was proposed as a temporary organization which would cease to exist "60 days after the submission of its final report." The final report was to be submitted "not later than 2 years from the date of the enactment of this act." Ten years later, the Civil Rights Commission is still with us and is supposed to submit its final report not later than January 31, 1968. The Civil Rights Commission

complains that it cannot maintain a competent staff unless it is given a 5-year extension instead of the shorter term extensions previously granted. This in itself demonstrates that the Civil Rights Commission has no intention of ever submitting a final report. Thus what starts out as temporary becomes permanent as far as Federal creations are concerned. Dissenting members of the Judiciary Committee warned of this in 1957, and I supported their contentions.

If this Commission deserved continuation, I would propose an amendment to make it permanent. However, it should never have been permitted to continue so long. The most significant recent accomplishment of the Civil Rights Commission is the publication of the results of a yearlong study entitled "Racial Isolation in the Public Schools," a document so radical in its recommendations that the White House and even Federal education czar Harold Howe II have followed a hands-off policy.

Among other things proposed by the Civil Rights Commission in this study was the enactment of a Federal statute requiring uniformly across the country the elimination of racial imbalance, which they define as any school having more than 50 percent of its students with non-white skin. Communities without enough white students in the area presumably would have to bus them in to fulfill percentage racial requirements. The long range proposal to overcome racial imbalance is to require that sites selected for low-rent Federal housing projects be chosen and rentals made on a basis which will bring about the proper racial mixture. Even urban renewal projects must follow this line to win approval. In other words, the answer to our problems, according to the Commission, lies in racism—the forcing of people to reside and attend school because of the color of their skin.

I wonder how the Civil Rights Commission missed altogether the complaints of Negro parents now being reported by the press against the elimination of predominantly Negro schools?

By extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission, we are promised that more projects of this type can be undertaken. I can say without a moment's hesitation that anything too radical for the White House and Commissioner Howe is definitely too radical for me, and I, for one, do not wish to finance any more such projects. I was recently forced by a sense of responsibility to vote for an increase in the debt ceiling caused by continuous waste and overspending of the peoples' money. I think the RECORD will show that I did not help create this financially unsound situation which the increased debt ceiling represents. To continue this Commission is, in itself, unjustifiable; to finance such radical mischief without a national debt hanging over us would be inexcusable; but to pay for this rot when we must raise the debt ceiling, lay out more than \$14 billion in interest on the national debt, and are asked to raise taxes is unconscionable, irrational, and deserving of the condemnation of every taxpayer in the country.

For 1968, the House allowance for the Civil Rights Commission is \$2,650,000 for the support of the Commission and its 153 employees. This works out to an expenditure of \$17,320 salary and expenses to keep each staff member on the job. Considering the work done, one dollar could not be justified.

Members may tell their constituents that they are looking for ways to reduce Federal spending. Here is an opportunity to vote a constructive "no" and live up to those statements about economy that pour forth from our offices.

Let the Civil Rights Commission submit its final report by January 31, 1968, as the present law requires, and let us be done with this unsound crowd.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 10805, which extends the existence of the Civil Rights Commission from January 31, 1968 to January 31, 1973, merits the approval of this House.

The President, in his message relative to racial discrimination, has recommended the extension of the Commission for an additional 5 years, as has the Department of Justice.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, as we all know, is an independent, bipartisan agency which was established by Congress in 1957. Its existence has been extended from time to time by the Congress. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that the existence of the Commission on a periodic basis has given rise to problems, such as hiring of personnel and planning. In 1964, the Congress extended the term of the Commission. It has been able to undertake studies on a variety of issues and to plan long-range projects, while in the past the Commission's program was one of factfinding and reporting of the denial of civil rights on the part of Negroes, particularly in the South. At present, the same program has been launched into the civil rights problems in the North. The Commission has been able to broaden its program beyond the scope of the basic civil rights problems, such as denial of the right to vote, discrimination in housing, and school segregation. There are many problems today in the field of civil rights which require the extension of the Commission. I emphasize that its principal function remains only to find facts and report to the President and the Congress. There is no law enforcement authority granted to the Commission.

The Commission is the only agency within our governmental structure which operates independently to study and analyze the impact of the various programs which the Government has undertaken. It is in a position to determine whether or not the policy contained in these programs is being effectively implemented on all levels—Federal, State, and local. It works closely with its State advisory committees. It cooperates and has close liaison with the various Federal departments administering programs.

In the past, the Commission's work has dealt principally with the issue of the denial of civil rights of Negroes, but presently it is about to consider the civil rights problems of other minority groups. The American Indian, and the Mexican-

American are subject to denial of civil rights and there is a great need for study to be done in these fields. The need here is for an independent, factfinding body, which the Commission is, in order to determine objectively what the facts are and to recommend what needs to be done. There is no agency in the Federal Government other than this Commission which can perform this necessary work. If this Congress is to legislate effectively, we need facts. The Commission is the agency which can submit these facts. Therefore, I recommend to this body favorable consideration of this legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we are considering a bill to extend for 5 years an agency which, in my opinion, is useless. It has become the propaganda mouthpiece of militant civil rightists.

In city after city, the Commission has held hearings which have distorted the true picture of racial relations. It affords twisted minds the opportunity of achieving the greatest amount of publicity. Irresponsible and reckless charges are made without the Commission making any effort to control such outbursts.

The Civil Rights Commission is costing the American taxpayers over \$2½ million each year. The prime goal of the Commission now appears to be bringing about racial balance in public schools. The Chairman of the Commission made this astounding statement to the Committee on Appropriations:

We consider long range that we will never really have as good education for negroes as for whites until we have a greater degree of racial balance than we have now.

Thus, the Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission parrots the line taken by militant civil rights activists who constantly insult the intelligence of American Negroes by declaring they are incapable of acquiring knowledge unless they sit by a white child.

The House would perform a great public service, give the taxpayers a break, and improve racial relations by defeating this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10805.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 284, nays 89, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—284

Adams
Addabbo

Albert
Anderson, Ill.

Anderson,
Tenn.

Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Bell
Betts
Blester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaino
Gibbons

Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hollifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczyński
Kupferman
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDonald,
Mich.
McEwen
McFall
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mailliard
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen

Ottenger
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Quie
Rallsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebell
Schweiker
Schwengel
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Udall
Tiernan
Ullman
Van Derlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Watkins
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wyder
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—89

Abbott
Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Belcher
Bennett
Bevill

Blackburn
Blanton
Brinkley
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burlison

Cabell
Colmer
Cramer
Davis, Ga.
Dickinson
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing

Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Everett
Fisher
Flynt
Fountain
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Gettys
Gross
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Hammer-
schmidt
Hardy
Henderson
Herlong
Jarman

Jones
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Landrum
Lennon
Long, La.
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Mills
Montgomery
Nichols
Passman
Patman
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor

Quillen
Rarick
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Satterfield
Scott
Selden
Sikes
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Stuckey
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Utt
Waggonner
Wampler
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Miss.
Willis

NOT VOTING—59

Adair
Baring
Barrett
Berry
Brook
Burton, Utah
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Feighan
Flood
Friedel
Grover
Gude
Hagan
Hansen, Idaho

Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hébert
Hungate
Karth
King, Calif.
Kyl
Lukens
McClure
McDade
Martin
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Konski

O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Pepper
Purcell
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rostenkowski
Sandman
St Germain
St. Onge
Shipley
Smith, N.Y.
Staggers
Stephens
Tuck
Tunney
Watson
Wilson,
Charles H.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts and Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. King of California and Mr. Dent for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.
Mr. Barrett and Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Tuck against.
Mr. Feighan and Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Hagan against.
Mr. Moore and Mr. Conable for, with Mr. Watson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Brook.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Meeds.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Stephens with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all

Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

IMPROVEMENT IN BENEFITS AND FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11089) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and to strengthen the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11089

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 8704(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) An employee eligible for insurance is entitled to be insured for an amount of group life insurance plus an equal amount of group accidental death and dismemberment insurance, in accordance with the following schedule; which schedule shall be automatically extended correspondingly whenever the rate of annual pay assigned by section 5313 of this title to positions of level II of the Executive Schedule is increased:

If annual pay is—		The amount of group life insurance is—	The amount of group accidental death and dismemberment insurance is—
Greater than—	But not greater than—		
0	\$750	\$1,000	\$1,000
\$750	1,500	2,000	2,000
1,500	2,250	3,000	3,000
2,250	3,000	4,000	4,000
3,000	3,750	5,000	5,000
3,750	4,500	6,000	6,000
4,500	5,250	7,000	7,000
5,250	6,000	8,000	8,000
6,000	6,750	9,000	9,000
6,750	7,500	10,000	10,000
7,500	8,250	11,000	11,000
8,250	9,000	12,000	12,000
9,000	9,750	13,000	13,000
9,750	10,500	14,000	14,000
10,500	11,250	15,000	15,000
11,250	12,000	16,000	16,000
12,000	12,750	17,000	17,000
12,750	13,500	18,000	18,000
13,500	14,250	19,000	19,000
14,250	15,000	20,000	20,000
15,000	15,750	21,000	21,000
15,750	16,500	22,000	22,000
16,500	17,250	23,000	23,000
17,250	18,000	24,000	24,000
18,000	18,750	25,000	25,000
18,750	19,500	26,000	26,000
19,500	20,250	27,000	27,000
20,250	21,000	28,000	28,000
21,000	21,750	29,000	29,000
21,750	22,500	30,000	30,000
22,500	23,250	31,000	31,000
23,250	24,000	32,000	32,000
24,000	24,750	33,000	33,000
24,750	25,500	34,000	34,000
25,500	26,250	35,000	35,000
26,250	27,000	36,000	36,000
27,000	27,750	37,000	37,000
27,750	28,500	38,000	38,000
28,500	29,250	39,000	39,000
29,250		40,000	40,000

(b) Section 8707 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 8707. Employee deductions; withholding
"During each period in which an employee is insured under a policy of insurance purchased by the Civil Service Commission under section 8709 of this title, there shall be

withheld from the pay of the employee his share of the cost of his group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance. The amount withheld shall be at the rate, adjusted to the nearest half cent, of 60 per centum of the level cost of each \$1,000 of insurance, as determined by the Commission. The amount withheld from an employee paid on other than a biweekly basis is determined at a proportional rule adjusted to the nearest half cent."

(c) Section 8708(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For each period in which an employee is insured under a policy of insurance purchased by the Civil Service Commission under section 8709 of this title, a sum equal to two-thirds the amount which is withheld from the pay of the employee under section 8707 of this title shall be contributed from the appropriation or fund which is used to pay him."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the sixtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act, but shall have no effect in the case of any employee who died, was finally separated, or retired before such date of enactment. In the case of an employee who dies or retires during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending immediately before the effective date of such amendments, the amount of insurance shall be determined as if such amendments were in effect during such period.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11089 provides a long-overdue modernization of the Government employees' life insurance program. The program was established by Public Law 598 of the 83d Congress, approved August 17, 1954. There has been no substantial change in the program for nearly 13 years.

H.R. 11089 makes three major changes. It replaces the outdated \$20,000 maximum of insurance, set in 1954, with a \$40,000 maximum. It grants every employee insurance equal to 1½ times his annual salary carried to the next higher thousand dollars. And it provides for financing the full level cost of the program, with premiums shared by employees and the Government on a 60-40 basis. Presently, employees pay two-thirds, and the Government pays one-third of fixed-rate contributions which fall about 8 cents per thousand dollars biweekly short of covering the full level cost.

Mr. Speaker, our Subcommittee on Retirement Insurance, and Health Benefits—and particularly the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS]—are to be highly commended for their fine work in developing this excellent bill and bringing it before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, H.R.

11089, the bill under consideration, serves two vital purposes by incorporating important changes in the Federal employees' group life insurance program. First, it provides improvement in the insurance protection of all Federal employees by increasing present coverage at least 33½ percent. Second, it not only provides for full funding of the proposed benefits by the employees and the Government, but for sharing the full costs of the presently underfinanced program as well.

The Government life insurance program is one upon which 2½ million Federal employees and several more millions of their family members depend heavily for the major part of their total insurance protection. The number and scope of bills that have been introduced on the subject demonstrate the keen interest of Members of Congress in the progress of the program's 13-year history. In fact, both the House and Senate last year demonstrated their concern for the inadequacies existing, and deficiencies being incurred, in the program by unanimously adopting a measure which provided greater benefits, at a higher price tag, than the proposal recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service today. H.R. 6926 of the 89th Congress, passed by the Congress without a dissenting vote, differed from H.R. 11089 by providing an additional \$2,000 of insurance not subject to reduction after retirement.

Most of us recall, I am sure, that the President attributed his disapproval of that bill to the inflationary dangers then present in the economy, and the high costs entailed to both the employees and the Government. The total cost of the vetoed bill would have come to about \$196 million, \$105 million of which would have been paid by employees, and \$91 million of which would have involved additional Government expenditures to the program.

To overcome these objections, the committee has agreed to a modification that reduces the total annual cost by almost \$90 million, while providing a progressive and attractive plan and fully financing all present and proposed costs. Since enactment in 1954 of an insurance program for Federal employees on a cost-sharing basis, coverage equal to the next higher thousand dollars approximating an employee's annual salary has been provided. Maximum coverage geared to the top salary levels existing in 1954 has been limited to \$20,000. The maximum premium authorized upon enactment has been consistently charged—25 cents biweekly to the employees and 12½ cents to the Government, totaling 37½ cents for each thousand dollars of coverage.

Free insurance coverage is available to retiring employees under certain conditions. Such coverage reduces, however, by 2 percent per month beginning upon retirement or at age 65, whichever occurs later. Minimum protection equal to 25 percent of the original face value is reached 38 months after the postretirement reduction begins.

The maximum 37½ cents biweekly premium authorized by law has been

charged since the program's creation. Although such premium had been contemplated to be sufficient to pay the level costs of the benefits, several relatively minor amendments to the law, without any increase in premiums, have increased the program's costs. These amendments encompassed lowering the requirements for free coverage after retirement from 15 years to 12 years; the crediting of military service toward such service requirements and a change whereby active employees over age 65 continue to be covered by the full face value of their policies. The rise in actuarial determinations that the level costs currently require a total premium of at least 45½ cents rather than 37½ cents, is attributable, principally, to these past liberalizations.

Evidence developed by the committee during public hearings in the 89th Congress, and again in the 90th Congress, indicates that insurance programs offered workers by employers in the private sector have progressed far beyond the Federal program, which has been largely unchanged since its inception. It is shown that the cost-sharing for life insurance programs in private industry has improved markedly, some industries paying all of the premiums and most sharing at least one-half.

While H.R. 11089 does not go as far as some measures would contemplate, nor to the extent employees and their representative organizations have urged, it is the unanimous judgment of the committee that a reasonable increase in life insurance coverage is highly desirable and prudently wise. The bill under consideration accomplishes a dual objective by extending greater protection for lower paid employees who can least afford to provide adequate insurance entirely at their own expense, and by furnishing appropriate coverage for higher level employees where recruitment and retention in Government service are most essential. It further modernizes the program by updating its maximum coverage which, in the opinion of the committee and the administration, is totally unrealistic in relation to current salary levels.

Although there is considerable sentiment to require equal sharing of premium costs, comparable to the minimal practice in private enterprise today, it is the consensus of the committee that the program's cost-sharing ratio be modernized from a 2-to-1 basis to a 3-to-2 basis—the employees' share to be increased from 25 cents to 27½ cents, and the Government's share to be increased from 12½ cents to 18½ cents per thousand. I wish to point out the fact that the employees will continue to pay the major portion—60 percent—of the total insurance premium. The bill removes the present statutory limitation of 25 cents per thousand and authorizes the Civil Service Commission to adjust premium rates in the event future actuarial determinations indicate increases as necessary to fully cover the level costs of the benefits.

Failure to provide for payment of premiums to cover the level costs of the benefits has resulted in annual deficiencies of \$40 million. Experience has evidenced that failure of the Government

to assure adequate financing of trust funds similar to the employees' life insurance fund inevitably leads to serious trouble. I have only to invite your attention to the fact that the history of the Government's contributions to the civil service retirement fund, has been one of "too little and too late." That kind of history, which presently causes a serious threat to its financial integrity, must not be repeated in the employees' life insurance program. The bill fulfills the present and future financial needs of this program.

H.R. 11089 will accomplish these objectives:

First, it fills, to a reasonable degree, the inadequacies of protection by increasing each employee's coverage by at least 33½ percent;

Second, it extends such coverage to persons earning up to \$30,000 and provides for automatic adjustment of the insurance schedule at such time as upper level salary schedules might be further extended;

Third, it overcomes the program's financial deficiencies by requiring full funding of the level costs of the benefits by a revised cost-sharing ratio.

Mr. Speaker, it is the consensus of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that H.R. 11089 offers answers to the objectives of a progressive program that is meaningful and essential to its financial needs, and one which serves the best interests of both the employees and the Government. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to wholeheartedly support the bill H.R. 11089, as it is unanimously reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. For a Member of Congress with reference to the reductions, it is 2 percent per month until it reaches 25 percent?

Mr. DANIELS. Not only for a Member of Congress, but for all Federal employees.

The bill under consideration provides for reductions after the age of 65 or retirement, whichever occurs later. The policy reduces at the rate of 2 percent per month, and 38 months later the policy will have reduced by 75 percent of the principal sum, leaving a balance of 25 percent of insurance in force.

Under the existing insurance program Members are entitled to \$20,000 of life insurance. After retirement, it would reduce to a basic level of \$5,000. Under the proposed bill each Member would have no less than \$10,000.

Mr. OLSEN. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, with respect to other employees, what is the improvement proposed?

Mr. DANIELS. What is the improvement with reference to other employees?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes. Is it the same 25 percent of the total?

Mr. DANIELS. The same formula applies to all Federal employees. The policy would reduce at the rate of 2 percent a month for the period of 38 months, to 25 percent of the principal sum.

Mr. OLSEN. Twenty-five percent; yes.
Mr. DANIELS. Yes, leaving a balance of 25 percent of the principal sum.

Mr. OLSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 11089, a bill amending the benefits and financing structure of the group life insurance plan available to the employees of the United States, which has been reported to the House unanimously by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and its Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits and cosponsored by 20 of its Members.

The present program insures each employee in an amount equal to the highest thousand dollars exceeding his annual salary, up to a maximum of \$20,000. The employee pays \$6.50 for each thousand dollars of coverage per year, or two-thirds of the cost. The employing agency contributes \$3.25 each year per thousand, or one-third of the cost.

After retirement on disability or on an immediate annuity upon completion of at least 12 years' service, the insurance is provided on a cost-free depreciating basis, the value of the policy eventually declining to 25 percent of its original face value. Accordingly, an employee whose salary is \$7,200 is insured for an amount of \$8,000, which subsequently depreciates to \$2,000 after retirement.

H.R. 11089 proposes increasing such an employee's coverage, predicated upon each \$750 or part thereof of salary, to \$10,000. The minimum amount of post-retirement coverage would be accordingly increased to \$2,500. The employee would continue to pay the major share of the premium, approximately \$7.15 for each thousand dollars of coverage each year, and the Government approximately \$4.72.

Testimony presented to the subcommittee, during its hearings on H.R. 464, recommended modifying the postretirement reduction from 2 percent to 1 percent each month, and revising the maximum amount of depreciation from 75 percent to 50 percent of full value. Several organizations urged the inclusion of previously retired employees, with particular respect to extending to them the irreducible \$2,000 additional unit of coverage contemplated in the introduced bill.

Being cognizant of the needs of the Government's faithful retirees and their survivors, the committee gave thorough and sympathetic consideration to such proposals. Providing active employees with \$2,000 of unreducing coverage would have entailed a Government cost of \$35 million annually, and was deleted from the pending measure to enhance the prospect of final approval. To extend the deleted provision to 400,000 deserving annuitants would have entailed an additional Government cost of \$800 million. The budgetary realities of today

simply precluded the committee from incorporating such a proposal in H.R. 11089.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration does not go as far as some proponents would desire. However, it is a reasonable measure, one which is financially sound, and a definite step toward a progressively ideal life insurance program. I urge its wholehearted adoption.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that my name does not appear as a cosponsor of this bill, even though I do support it, and I was given that opportunity, but I did not cosponsor the bill because I have some reservations about two of the provisions of the bill.

One is the ratio by which the cost is divided by the Government and the employees. I would prefer to see a 50-50 sharing basis. I would also prefer to see a \$30,000 maximum on the amount of insurance rather than the \$40,000.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and I urge that it be adopted by the House.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, back in the year 1954 I sponsored and floor managed the legislation under which this life insurance program came into being. The law has been very slightly changed since that time and it is now obviously quite out of date because of inflation, because of changes in the salary structure, and the like.

This bill, as reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, does correct many of the inadequate features of the system and by providing a new method for funding it, it is our confident prediction that the program will be self-sustaining—and that it will be a very wholesome thing.

Second, we believe that increasing the maximum amount of insurance available to \$40,000 is in keeping with the increased salaries that are paid not only in the Congress but to many of those in the executive branch.

This bill which really could be titled a bill for the relief and security of widows and children is a very wholesome bill, and I hope it passes unanimously as it did in the committee. I hope that because we have retailored it to meet the President's objection to the bill that passed last year that the President will see fit to sign it into law and that we will have for our employees a life insurance program that is more modern and up to date and more in keeping with practices in private industry.

I recognize that this bill does not do everything that some of us would like to see done in this program, but those features, if they ever are enacted into law, will have to wait for another amendment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I again urge that we pass this bill and move it along to the day when it will be the law and all of our employees will be enjoying its many benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3

minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 11089, which I am privileged to cosponsor.

I want to commend the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] as well as the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] on what has been an excellent job of investigation and negotiation on the subject of what can be done economically and without great expense to the taxpayers in the way of improving the life insurance of Federal employees.

Like our friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] I think we could have had or should have had a greater participation on the part of the employer, but it just would be too expensive at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11089, which I am privileged to cosponsor, a bill providing needed improvements in the life insurance program of the Federal work force, while strengthening the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund.

I wish, first of all, to commend the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, for his diligence and dedication in seeking to obtain advances in the field of employee benefits and for his continuous concern for the financial soundness of this program that is of such vital importance to all Federal workers and their families. I commend the committee's acting unanimously and responsibly in bringing before the House a measure that keeps faith with our employees, and one which I feel is in the interest of the United States.

Since enactment of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, this program has consistently furnished coverage equal to the employee's annual salary, plus an equal amount of accidental death and dismemberment insurance. It has consistently limited coverage, anachronistically, to the maximum salary ceilings in effect 13 years ago. It has been equally consistent in failing to authorize premiums sufficient to cover the full costs of the benefits payable—a failure which incurs an annual deficit in the insurance fund of \$40 million.

During the 13-year history of the program, the premium sharing of life insurance programs in the private economy has progressed significantly. Reliable Government surveys disclose that many industries provide its work force cost-free life insurance protection, while the vast majority pay at least one-half the premiums. The subcommittee, during its public hearings on the subject, developed evidence that the insurance benefits offered to workers by model employers in private enterprise have improved markedly, while no relative or significant advances have been made in the Federal program with respect to career employees since its inception.

H.R. 11089 modernizes the program, to a reasonable extent, by providing one-third more insurance during an employee's service, and a slightly greater

death benefit payable after retirement. This is a small, but significant, step forward.

While existing reserves have been adequate to pay the increasing costs of the coverage, the costs will eventually increase to the point that a substantial increase will be necessary to pay the premiums required to soundly finance the benefits. The committee proposes avoiding this eventuality by revising the cost-sharing from its present 2-to-1 ratio to a 3-to-2 ratio, increasing the Government's contribution from 33 percent to 40 percent of the total premium. Although it revises the employee's share from 66 percent to 60 percent, still requiring the employee to pay the major portion of the cost, it does not attain the minimal ideal 50-50 sharing practice prevalent in the private sector. It is noteworthy that a provision is included authorizing the Civil Service Commission to establish and revise, on a 60-40 basis, the rate of contributions to meet the actual level costs of the program, when deemed necessary.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, the unanimous adoption of H.R. 11089.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for H.R. 11089. The increased insurance coverage provided by this bill will be a great help to the families of Federal employees, especially those with lower incomes. It is these employees who can least afford to buy insurance privately or put back substantial savings for their families to live on in the event of their death. These improved benefits will help lift—at least partially—the burden of providing for a family at a time when increased living costs cause problems enough.

It is also heartening that the cost-sharing of this insurance has been adjusted from a 2-to-1 employee-Government ratio to a 3-to-2 ratio. While encouraging, this, in my opinion, is still not as it should be. The Government should follow the lead set by many private industry insurance plans, in which the company assumes the entire cost of the insurance. While I consider the adjustment made by this bill a good sign and a start in the direction of a better cost-sharing plan, I believe we should continue to work toward at least a 1-to-1 ratio of cost sharing.

In addition, I would like to have seen a provision covering rate of reduction of the value of this insurance. Presently, Mr. Speaker, the rate beginning at age 65 or retirement is 2 percent per month to a floor of 25 percent of face value, a bill introduced by Congressman OLSEN, H.R. 3380, would change this to a 1 percent per month rate of reduction to a floor of 50 percent of face value. This measure is presently pending in our committee, but since it is so closely related, I would like to express my support for it at this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that a bill similar to H.R. 11089 was passed by the Congress last year only to be vetoed by the President. The grounds for this veto were that it would be an inflationary measure. It is my view that the veto did very little toward stemming the flow of inflation, but it did make the families of Federal employees potentially greater victims of inflation for another year. Now

we, the Congress, have the opportunity to correct that by passing this legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11089 is a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees and to strengthen the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund. Today this bill, favorably reported with amendment by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, is scheduled for consideration by the House under suspension of the rules.

H.R. 11089 would make several major changes in the financing and in the amount of benefits an individual is entitled to receive. Specifically it would:

- (1) require the Government and employees to share the full cost of the insurance program by authorizing an increase in the employee and agency contributory rates.
- (2) change the cost-sharing ratio by raising the Government's contribution rate from 33½% to 40% of the total premium, and by lowering the employee's rate from 66½% to 60% of the premium.
- (3) provide at least 33% more protection for employees at all salary levels.

Essentially H.R. 11089 is identical in purpose to the provisions of H.R. 6926, 89th Congress, with the exception of the elimination of one provision. This measure passed both Houses, but was vetoed by the President stately because of its cost. In an effort to reduce the price tag of the proposed legislation, the committee deleted the most costly provision, that provision which provided an additional unit of \$2,000 insurance which would not reduce after retirement. By eliminating this provision the committee was able to lower the cost to the Government of the proposed legislation from \$91 million to \$56 million—a reduction of \$35 million.

The need to improve the financing of the existing program is urgent. Current benefits are presently underfinanced; a \$40 million annual deficit is being incurred. The present contributory rates set by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of 1954 are too low to cover the actual continuing cost of the insurance. They are too low primarily because minor progressive revisions since 1954 have increased the program's costs without concurrently increasing the contributory rates. By allowing the Commission to set rates at a level which would cover the actual cost of the benefits provided, the proposed legislation would put the program on a self-sustaining basis.

The proposed liberalization of the amount of benefits to which an employee is entitled under the program is long overdue. Statistics compiled by the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, during its public hearings on H.R. 464, show that insurance programs offered workers by employers in private industry have improved markedly, while no significant amendments have been made in the Federal program with respect to career employees since the program's inception in 1954. In addition to being a step toward comparability with the private sector, the proposed increase in coverage would give more protection and security to lower echelon employees who can least afford private insurance as well as help

to recruit and retain higher level employees whose services are essential to administrative excellence.

H.R. 11089, as proposed, would render the Federal Government's Insurance Program for its employees more sound, more equitable, and more progressive. I strongly urge each of you to support this bill.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11089, a bill which would provide needed improvement in the life insurance protection of Federal employees.

I introduced a measure similar to the legislation we are now considering, except that my bill, H.R. 7849, would extend to presently retired Federal employees the benefit of an additional \$2,000 worth of life insurance which would not be subject to the monthly reduction provisions. Our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, however, has deleted this provision—the costliest item—in order to report a measure which would be more receptive to the administration's program.

The deletion of the provision for \$2,000 irreducible life insurance coverage would reduce the cost of the bill now on the floor to \$56 million. This is a substantial reduction from the \$91 million price tag of the 1966 bill which was vetoed by the President. H.R. 11089, therefore, pegs the cost of these needed life insurance improvements in the vicinity of the midpoint between the administration proposal which would cost \$13.4 million and the \$91 million which the 1966 bill would have cost the Government. Because I feel strongly that the group life insurance program for our Federal employees ought to be immediately strengthened in order to have it compare favorably with insurance programs offered workers by employers in the private sector, I urge a favorable vote for H.R. 11089.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11089.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is ordered.

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION OF CAREER STATUS BY CERTAIN TEMPORARY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S.

1320) to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1320

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after section 3304 the following new section:

"§ 3304a. Competitive service; career appointment after three years' temporary service

"(a) Except as provided by subsection (b), and subject to subsection (c), of this section an individual serving in a position in the competitive service under an indefinite appointment or a temporary appointment pending establishment of a register (other than an individual serving in GS-16, GS-17, or GS-18) acquires competitive status and is entitled to have his appointment converted to a career appointment, when—

"(1) he completes, without a break in service of more than thirty days, a total of at least three years of service in such a position;

"(2) he passes a suitable unassembled, noncompetitive examination;

"(3) the appointing authority (A) recommends to the Civil Service Commission that the appointment be converted to a career appointment, and (B) certifies to the Commission that the work performance of the individual for the past twelve months has been satisfactory; and

"(4) he meets current Commission qualification requirements for the position, and is otherwise eligible for career appointment.

"(b) An individual serving in a position in the competitive service in the postal field service under a temporary appointment without a definite time limitation (other than an individual serving in a postmaster or rural carrier position) acquires competitive status and is entitled to have his appointment converted to a career appointment, when—

"(1) he completes, without a break in service of more than thirty days, at least three years of service in such a position during each of which he has been paid for at least seven hundred hours of work;

"(2) he passes a suitable unassembled, noncompetitive examination;

"(3) the appointing authority (A) recommends to the Civil Service Commission that the appointment be converted to a career appointment and (B) certifies to the Commission (1) that the work performance of the individual for the past twelve months has been satisfactory and (2) that straight time hours as determined by the past twelve months' experience of career substitutes on the rolls on the date of the certification will not be reduced solely because of the conversion; and

"(4) he meets current Commission qualification requirements for the position, and is otherwise eligible for career appointment.

Section 3302 of title 39 does not apply with respect to the operation of this subsection.

"(c) In computing years of service under subsections (a) (1) and (b) (1) of this section for an individual who leaves a position in the competitive service to enter the armed forces and is reemployed in such a position within one hundred and twenty days after separation under honorable conditions, the period from the date he leaves his position to the date he is reemployed is included.

"(d) The appointment of an individual who does not pass a suitable unassembled, noncompetitive examination under subsection (a) (2) of this section, who is not recommended for conversion to career appointment

under subsection (a) (3) of this section, or who fails to qualify under subsection (a) (4) of this section, shall be terminated not later than ninety days after he has completed the three-year period referred to in subsection (a) (1) of this section.

"(e) The Commission may prescribe regulations necessary for the administration of this section."

(b) The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new item immediately below item 3304:

"3304a. Competitive service; career appointment after three years' temporary service."

Sec. 2. The first sentence of section 1310(a) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 757), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive service shall be made on other than a permanent basis: *Provided*, That any position vacated by a permanent employee called to military service or transferred to a national defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary or indefinite basis."

Sec. 3. (a) This section and section 2 of this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The first section of this Act shall become effective on the one hundred and twentieth day following the date of enactment of this Act. In the case of an individual who, prior to such effective date, shall have completed the three-year period referred to in section 3304a(d) of title 5, United States Code, as enacted by the first section of this Act, the date of such completion shall be deemed to be such effective date.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1320, as amended, to provide for the acquisition of career status for certain temporary employees of the Federal Government and for other purposes.

S. 1320, as amended, which was unanimously voted out of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on June 17, offers a timely solution to a personnel administrative problem in the Federal Government; namely, the appropriate appointment arrangements for employees who have served for an extended period in a temporary status without prospects of regular status or benefits.

The purposes of S. 1320, with the committee amendments, are twofold:

First, to make it possible for certain Federal employees, including employees in the postal field service, to acquire competitive status and to have their appointments converted to career appointments.

Second, to remove the permanent statutory ceiling on the number of permanent Federal employees.

Under existing civil service regulations, appointing officers in Federal agencies

can employ a person in a temporary capacity for a permanent position when a suitable civil service register of eligible candidates is not available. Such an employee continues on the job until an examination is held, a register established, and an appointment is made on a permanent basis. Sometimes a special register cannot be justified in the immediate future.

The Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee in late 1966, working with the Civil Service Commission, developed data indicating that there were some 19,000 Federal personnel working in permanent positions but without career status through no fault of their own. When hired, the Government did not have registers covering these positions. Of the 19,000, the subcommittee found that some 8,000 had been working in the same jobs for 3 years or longer. In fact, over 4,200 had been working for 5 years or more without status.

Federal Government personnel, working as TAPERS, face the following personnel administrative problems:

First. No retirement privileges under the civil service retirement system;

Second. They can be separated at any time by the employing authority;

Third. No appeal rights under Civil Service Commission regulations;

Fourth. In case of a reduction in force the only employees with lower retention credits are those serving in limited temporary appointments;

Fifth. Limited promotional opportunities within the agency;

Sixth. They cannot transfer under the TAPER appointment to another job; and

Seventh. They are not covered by the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

The legislation before the House today will correct these personnel problems.

The first section of S. 1320, as amended, will entitle employees, except those in the postal field service, who are serving in positions of the competitive service under a temporary appointment pending the establishment of a register, to acquire a career status. An employee's appointment can be converted to a career appointment, when he meets all of the specified conditions. Individuals in super-grade positions are excluded. The conditions which must be met are:

First. The employee completes a total of at least 3 years' service in his position without a break in service of more than 30 days;

Second. He passes a suitable, unassembled, noncompetitive examination;

Third. The appointing authority recommends to the Civil Service Commission the conversion of the appointment to a career appointment, and certifies to the Commission that the work performance of the individual for the past 12 months has been satisfactory; and

Fourth. That he meets Commission qualification requirements for the position and is otherwise eligible for a career appointment.

Subsection (b) of section 1 relates to an individual serving in a position in the competitive service in the postal field service working under a temporary ap-

pointment without a definite time limitation, and authorizes conversion of such temporary appointments to career appointments for such individuals. The standards to be met are substantially the same, as I detailed above, except that the period of service must be at least 3 years during each of which the employee has been paid for at least 700 hours of work and that the straight time hours of work of the other employees in that office will not be reduced solely because of the conversion. Postmasters and rural carriers are excluded.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 1310(a) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, commonly referred to as the Whitten amendment, to delete the reference to the numerical ceiling on permanent appointments. The remaining provisions of this section would not be affected. These include: restrictions on rapid promotions, overgrading of positions and veterans' rights. By lifting the personnel ceilings, we are recognizing the unprecedented growth that has taken place in our economy, in our population, and the services to be provided.

The committee members have noted over the years that Federal employee ceiling restrictions have forced management officials in several agencies to resort to the use of either combat-trained military or contractor personnel to perform work historically and successfully done by civil service employees. Many times the alternatives are more expensive.

In recommending this change, the committee members do not consider the removal of the ceiling as a lack of interest on their part in controlling or limiting civilian employment but as a recognition of the need to consider the total labor costs to get the job done. Likewise, the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee plans to continue to review the changing employment patterns in the Federal Government in light of work to be performed and the promotional opportunities of the Government employees called to active military duty. If conditions again warrant a ceiling the subcommittee will initiate legislation to that end.

It must be reiterated, the other provisions of the Whitten amendment—namely, restrictions on rapid promotions, overgrading of positions, and veterans' rights—are not only maintained but are as necessary today as in 1952.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we have before us today has been strongly endorsed by administration spokesmen, including the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the Postmaster General, and by numerous employee group leaders—leaders representing both postal employees as well as employees in other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana, one of my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. OLSEN. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1320 and also commend the gentleman from North Carolina in the well [Mr. HENDERSON] for the excellent job and for the exhaustive examination

into the many problems in this bill. I believe it will make Federal service more attractive to people now employed by the Federal Government, and I hope it will continue to make the Federal service more attractive to them, and attract others to Federal service. I commend the gentleman very highly on the superb job. I cannot more highly endorse this bill. I hope the Members will vote for it unanimously.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thank the gentleman from Montana for his support.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I should like to add my compliments to the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of this distinguished subcommittee, for the action has always taken in behalf of our valued Government employees, and especially for the study he has made with regard to all matters pertaining to manpower in the civil service or the postal service, and its proper utilization, which is a direct responsibility of this Congress. As I understand the bill before us today, would it eliminate the competitive examination feature in order to establish a register for all those who had had temporary employment for 3 years?

Mr. HENDERSON. It would provide for an unasssembled noncompetitive examination, which is not the usual competitive examination.

I would point out to the gentleman that the purpose of the competitive examination is to determine whether or not an applicant can do a job, and if he is the most qualified applicant.

As the distinguished Chairman of the Civil Service Commission testified before our subcommittee, the best test is the fact that the man has been performing the job for the 3-year period, and satisfactorily. It must be certified by the agency that his work has been satisfactory for the last 12 months, before he can be considered for conversion.

Mr. HALL. I understand the four stipulations. I believe they are valid. In fact, I had certain functions as a personnel officer at a time during World War II when this would have been very desirable from the point of view of the executive department.

Does the gentleman not feel that we are getting to the place we are allowing agencies and the administration and the executive branch in particular to make decisions which perhaps should be made by the Congress?

Mr. HENDERSON. Except for one thing with regard to this particular area. We are insisting that the Civil Service Commission speed up its examining process. We have been assured that by the consolidation of examining boards over the Nation there should be a lesser need for temporary appointments in the first instance.

I am sure the gentleman would agree that while there have been reasons for these TAPER appointments, that is not the best way to get the best employees in Federal service.

Mr. HALL. I certainly do agree. I am not for increasing temporary appointments. On the other hand, I hate to see,

as the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission said, just another one-time cleanup.

Actually, what this amounts to is a channeling into permanent service of all of those who have served well, or whom someone certifies as having served well for a period of 3 years.

Mr. HENDERSON. I could not agree with the gentleman more.

I believe the very fact that the committee is here today with this legislation demonstrates that we feel Congress should keep oversight in this area, rather than to have coverage by Executive order, as has been the case in the two most recent instances.

If necessary, Congress ought to know why, and ought to investigate, as we have done in this case, and present the matter before the full Congress, as we do, for action today.

Mr. HALL. Once the legislation is passed they will not have to come back to Congress, unless we rescind this action.

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman is correct. But it is the clear intent of the subcommittee, in its report, that if the administration is not continued as we believe it should be, they will have to come back at least before our subcommittee, to assure us, and to give us the reasons why it has not been administered as we understand it should be.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the legislative record.

Am I correctly advised that maintenance employees of all Federal buildings must be veterans now, by law?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not certain. Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Examinations are limited to them.

Mr. HALL. In other words, that is true for maintenance employees of all Federal buildings, not just U.S. post offices?

Mr. DULSKI. For all Federal buildings.

Mr. HALL. The examinations and the establishment of a register are limited to veterans; is that correct?

Mr. DULSKI. Yes. They have the preference.

Mr. HALL. Is it not true, with this preference, assuming they pass an examination with 70 points, they will not only be given veterans' preference, of 5 or 10 percent, depending upon service-connected disability, but will be put at the head of the list? Is that correct?

Mr. DULSKI. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Is it not also true they may draw their retirement benefits from the military at the same time they are earning in this new capacity, after an appointment from the register?

Mr. DULSKI. Subject to the Dual Compensation Act.

Mr. HALL. That is right, but the Dual Compensation Act excludes these people in particular. I can give you instance after instance where this is happening and where up to 33½ percent of the disabled veterans are off duty as new civil service appointees with preference given all the time.

If the gentleman will yield further, my

question is this: I simply want to make a legislative record and point out to the distinguished committee that I wonder if we are not coming to the time and place where maintenance involves not only broom pushers and people who mop down and clean up in the Federal buildings at the end of the day but also people who are involved in maintenance of machinery as we become more and more automated. They are maintenance employees, but I wonder if we are not getting to the point where we should give serious consideration to this. I want to mention that as a member of the Committee on Armed Services I am very keenly interested in veterans preferences. I doubt very much if they should draw both retirement, which is tax free, for physical disability and their new civil service preferential appointment on full pay. I know if they will be off 15, 20, or 33 percent of the time and they are not maintenance employees other than custodians, that we are coming to the time and the place where we should give serious consideration in the subcommittee and in the full committee to their particular utilization.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the distinguished chairman, there is a comment that I would like to make to the gentleman from Missouri in response. I want to say that we are fortunate the chairman of our full committee also serves on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. That is why I thought I would yield to him, because this is a matter which is within the jurisdiction of that committee.

Specifically with regard to your comments on the Dual Compensation Act, I might point out to the gentleman that we have divergent views. A very distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services approached me the other day saying that the Dual Compensation Act should be liberalized so employees covered by the act could draw more of their retired military pay as well as the full pay benefits. This has been before our subcommittee. The Dual Compensation Act was handled by the subcommittee. We recognize it is a problem, but at this time and as a part of this legislation we are not prepared to take it up.

Mr. HALL. Yes, I understand that, but I did want to get this before the committee. I appreciate the gentleman's reassurance and am sure that we can disagree without being disagreeable. This does not eliminate the Whitten amendment?

Mr. HENDERSON. You are absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority member of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I think that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] raised a very interesting point. I think this is something that the committee ought to go into. I am very much for the veterans' preference, but I think here is a situation which, as he says, is growing with regard to the matter of numbers of maintenance personnel involved. I think the Post Office and Civil Service Committee ought to take a look at it from

the standpoint of personnel and the utilization of manpower in the Federal Government. It may be that jurisdiction belongs in the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I do not know. I do think that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee ought to have a look at this situation.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very much appreciative of the gentleman's contribution to this legislation. I think we could agree that the point the gentleman from Missouri made with regard to the increased level of maintenance people on the maintenance of postal equipment is a matter that our full committee or one of the subcommittees has gone into this year. All of these problems are oftentimes interrelated.

But again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge the adoption of the Senate bill as amended.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee the number of people that will be affected by this legislation and if he knows the length of time some of them have been in the Government service under temporary appointment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, we know that in 1966, at the time we did the study with the Civil Service Commission, there were over 19,000. Of that group there are over 4,200 who have served over the 3-year period and who are certified in this bill now pending before us today with respect to the length of service. There is a sizable number that have been in service over 10 or 12 years and, certainly, we feel that if they have performed in a temporary status satisfactorily to the Government, that there is a point at which they should be entitled to a career status.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to say that I am sure the distinguished chairman shares my concern for the welfare of all Government employees. It is my further opinion that this is a situation which represents a matter that undoubtedly needs correction and study.

Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the proposal.

Mr. HENDERSON. The distinguished gentleman, a member of our committee, obviously knows of the benefits provided hereunder for our various Federal employees, but for the benefit of all the Members of the House, I would point out that our study revealed that these temporaries are scattered all over the United States, and the need for this legislation not only exists in the centers where they have such heavy Federal employment, but in other areas as well.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] if the gentleman knows that the legislation includes authority for these temporary employees in the postal field service to acquire competitive career status, provided they meet the standards laid down under this legislation.

We discussed in the committee, however, certain problems that may occur when these conversions take place. I think there are problems now, particularly in areas where we are faced with surplus career regular and substitute clerks in the mobile service because of the curtailment and discontinuation of railway postal units. I note that this problem was alluded to in our report. I wonder if the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] could give us any information as to just what rights these employees have? Would the enactment of this legislation in any way take away their rights of finding jobs at post offices near their present homes?

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly shall answer the question propounded by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL]. But, first, I would like to say that the contributions which the gentleman has made to the subcommittee's deliberations this year, and particularly in the consideration of this legislation, have been most important. I wish to commend the gentleman for his diligence and very fine assistance.

Specifically, with reference to the gentleman's interrogation in respect to post office employees, it was the interest of the gentleman from North Carolina who has yielded to me in this area that brought about specific language in the bill with respect to substitute clerks and how they might be affected. In that instance we were able to come up with language which we thought should be contained in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the specific request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] with reference to the continuance of the mobile units and the shifting of those people back into the postal service, we were not so successful as reflected by the language as contained in the bill. However, on page 6 of the report the gentleman will find that we included some very strong language to this effect:

The committee has been assured by representatives of the Post Office Department that every effort will be exerted to protect the rights, and to give all possible assistance to the mobile clerks who are now facing reassignment because of the discontinuance of the mobile units.

And, Mr. Speaker, I might say in further answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], I realize that there are a lot of these employees in the areas that the gentleman represents, and that with the two of us now serving on this subcommittee, it is my opinion that we should be able to do a good job in seeing that their rights are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1320, as amended. This bill would pro-

vide much needed relief to many Federal employees who have been hired to work for the Federal Government, are doing a satisfactory or better job, and through no fault of their own they lack status and retirement benefits.

From time to time in the past both Congress and the President have provided relief for TAPER employees. During the 84th and 85th Congresses, legislation was enacted to provide conversion to career status for certain temporary employees in the classified and postal services.

Recent Executive orders have also been issued to provide career status. In October 1964, certain employees in the postal field service were given career appointments. Then in March 1965, an Executive order permitted certain Treasury employees to be given career appointments.

As the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee have stated emphatically in our report on this bill, we do not regard this proposed legislation as a means of abating the competitive processes of the civil service system. In the words of the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, this legislation provides "another one-time clean-up."

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the bill before us today, S. 1320, as amended. Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1320, as amended.

This bill corrects an inequity for Federal Government employees who have been hired by the Government for permanent jobs and who are doing satisfactory work.

Under existing civil service regulations, Federal agencies can employ persons in a temporary capacity for permanent-type jobs when suitable civil service registers of eligible candidates are not available. These employees continue on the job until examinations are held, registers are established, and appointments are made on a permanent basis. These Government workers are what we call TAPER appointments—temporary appointments pending establishment of a register. They have been hired to fill needs but have not acquired career status simply because the Civil Service Commission has not conducted appropriate examinations.

It is my understanding, after hearing testimony from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, that many of these appointments are in occupations where there is relatively little employment and the Commissioners felt it economically unwise to conduct examinations for so limited a number of job vacancies.

The bill before us today lays down specific criteria for these TAPER employees to meet. If they can meet them, then career status is possible. The criteria include: three years in a position in the competitive service; passing a suitable, unassembled, noncompetitive examination; meeting Civil Service Commission qualification requirements; and

management's certification of a satisfactory performance on the job.

In public hearings on this proposed legislation, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission assured the members of the committee that the Commission had no intention of relaxing its standards in the Government's competitive examination program. The Commission has wisely adopted suggestions made some 2 years ago by my able colleague from North Carolina and chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service, Hon. DAVID HENDERSON, whereby the examining and recruiting procedures of the Commission are being revised and, in turn, placed under tighter control by the Commission. John Macy, Chairman of the Commission, has assured the subcommittee that these reforms will reduce the number of TAPER appointments in the future and also will provide a more suitable service to the public.

The bill before us today reflects, to a marked degree, the work of our Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee. We are continually reviewing the manpower and civil service policies and operating techniques of the departments and agencies. I feel certain that the Chairman is going to continue an active review of personnel policies and practices in the Federal Government and will take appropriate action.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just to establish a legislative record, is the bill under consideration under suspension of the rules, S. 1320, identical with the bill, H.R. 8495, on which hearings were held by the same subcommittee?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. This is the bill, as amended in committee. The amendments have been pointed out.

Mr. HALL. In other words, the bill under consideration as amended in committee, would be generally the same as the bill on which the hearings were held?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FINDLEY was granted permission to speak out of order.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, years ago a Congressman listened to President Theodore Roosevelt deliver an inspirational speech filled with moral injunction. After it was over he observed dryly to a friend:

The thing I admire most about Teddy Roosevelt is his original discovery of the Ten Commandments.

I was reminded of this when I heard what our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK], had to say about the Farm Bureau and its insurance companies. One would think he had made an original discovery.

No doubt about it. Farm Bureau is in the insurance business in a big way.

Now that the gentleman from New York has acquired this knowledge, he should not stop there. A little knowledge, it is said, is a dangerous thing, and our colleague should go all the way, and get all the facts he can about not only Farm Bureau, but the other major farm organizations as well. They should be invited to supply membership figures, sources of income, financial statement, summary of activities, and also full information on affiliated activities. Three of the major organizations—Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, and the Grange—have their insurance companies. At one point at least, Farmers Union did rather extensive contract work for the Federal Government under the poverty program. It may still be so involved.

The gentleman from New York could provide a useful service in acquainting the public with all facets of farm organizations, and it may be that some changes are desirable. I would not attempt to prejudge the situation, and I would hope that all farm organizations will welcome scrutiny and improvements.

Several years ago, I recall, Farm Bureau successfully led a legislative effort which resulted in deferred dividends of cooperatives being subjected to taxation. I have always felt that cooperatives should bear their fair share of the Federal tax load, and frankly I have yet to find a Farm Bureau leader who argued against the point. Maybe additional changes are in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say this not only to my colleague from Illinois, but to all of my colleagues in this House: that I read with some concern the words of my distinguished colleague from New York with respect to Charles Shuman, the president of the Farm Bureau Federation, who lives in Moultrie County in my district. I would like to say for the Record that I know of no person whose own personal integrity is thought more highly of in my entire congressional district than Charles Shuman.

Charles Shuman is a farmer. He lives on a farm, in Moultrie County, Ill. His family was one of the earliest of our settlers, going back into the 1830's. In Moultrie County the Shuman family itself is very widespread, and they are all equally as well thought of as Mr. Shuman. He is widely known in his field, and one of the most distinguished men in the field of agriculture in the entire United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleague from New York will also take note of the fact that Charles Shuman has been a registered Democrat in Moultrie County, as are most of his family, and I believe his family for more than 100 years have been connected with the Democrat Party.

So there is nothing partisan about this at all. I do want to make clear the entire record that this man has made. His reputation is excellent. I know of no person in my congressional district who is more highly thought of than Charlie Shuman. He made a great record as

president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, which is the largest farm bureau in all of the 50 States. On that record alone, he was made president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. As Charlie Shuman knows, he and I have not always agreed, and I am sure that my distinguished colleague now addressing us from the well of the House has not always agreed with Mr. Shuman, but this has never in any way detracted from my regard for the sincerity and the conviction of Charlie Shuman as a man and as a person in agriculture who is trying to do the best job, as he understands it, for agriculture. I am happy to say to my colleagues in this House that Charlie Shuman personally is one of the finest men I know.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fine contribution made by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Although I do not pretend to have all the facts about farm organizations—or all the facts about Farm Bureau, for that matter—I have had the opportunity over a period of 20 years—first as a newspaperman, then as a Congressman—to observe firsthand the local, State, and national leadership provided by Farm Bureau.

Illinois has the largest Farm Bureau organization in the Nation and, I believe, always has had this distinction. For years an Illinoisan, Charles Shuman, has served with distinction as president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. He moved to that position from the presidency of the Illinois Agricultural Association—Farm Bureau—a position which has been occupied with equal distinction for years by William Kuhfuss.

During my years as a newspaperman I came to know personally many of the county directors of Farm Bureau and members of their organization staff. As Congressman and for 6 years as Illinois' only Congressman on the House Agriculture Committee, I came to know personally the professional staff of both the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Illinois Agricultural Association, as well as the AFBF staff which does legislative work on the Hill.

In all those years I have never known a Farm Bureau leader or employee who was anything but honest, straightforward, and high type in every respect. Never once have I been misled or given misinformation by anyone connected with Farm Bureau. In my book Farm Bureau is a synonym for integrity.

Although more often than not I have admired and supported the legislative positions of Farm Bureau, there have been occasions when I have been opposed. But regardless of whether I supported or opposed their recommendations, I never once had reason to question the integrity of the organization or the people in it.

And I shudder to think what would have happened to freedom on the American farm during those tumultuous years,

1961-63, had it not been for the effective leadership of Farm Bureau—leadership which was brought to bear in opposition to straitjacket legislation and in behalf of freedom to plant.

I make no claim that Farm Bureau is perfect—and it may well be that some changes should be made in the cooperative affiliations of all farm organizations—but I cannot sit quietly and hear the gentleman from New York voice charges of fraud and confidence game against Farm Bureau without rising to state my personal respect and admiration for the men who make up Farm Bureau. The ones I know are all fine, decent Americans, and I am confident the insinuations against them will soon evaporate in the political heat our colleague has generated.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman has taken this time to make the statement he is now making on the floor of the House with respect to the American Farm Bureau. I am also very pleased to hear the words of our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

I heartily endorse what my colleagues from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY and Mr. SPRINGER] have said about the Farm Bureau and its president, Charlie Shuman. We may seem to be here defending an organization and its president when, in fact, neither needs any defense. The constructive contribution the American Farm Bureau and its president have made to agriculture and to our national welfare generally belies the charges that have been made.

Without question, the Farm Bureau is the most outstanding farmers' organization in the country. And, without question, Charlie Shuman is a man of unimpeachable character. I might add that I have known him for many years, and I am well acquainted with other officers in the organization. In no one organization will be found men more dedicated to the cause of the farmer, to the advancement of agriculture, and to our country's well-being.

I have not always agreed with all that the Farm Bureau has advocated. But I have always known that what they have proposed represented their best judgment as to what is best for the farmers themselves and agriculture generally.

I am pleased that the facts have been set straight here this afternoon. What we are saying here is no more than what the American farmers and everyone who has had any knowledge of the Farm Bureau's operations have long recognized.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1320.

A special word of appreciation is in order to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], for the careful and skillful manner in which he has guided the subcommittee in producing this legislation. It has been a privilege for me to work under his leadership in this task.

The evidence before the Subcommittee

on Manpower and Civil Service showed that there were approximately 19,200 Federal employees who have served for an extended period in a temporary status without prospect of regular status, promotion, or benefit. Of this number, 8,110 have been working at the same job on a temporary basis for over 5 years. The injustices of such a situation are obvious and should be removed. These TAPER—temporary appointments pending establishment of a register—appointees who have served for extended periods should have opportunities for advancement and they should have reduction-in-force protection. They should have retirement privileges and opportunities which a permanent employee in a similar position is entitled to. Under the existing circumstances, however, through no fault of their own, they have none of the above benefits.

S. 1320, a bill to provide acquisition of career status by certain temporary Government employees, rectifies the above-mentioned injustices by making it possible for TAPER appointees who have completed at least 3 years of service in such positions without a break in service of more than 30 days, to acquire competitive status and to have their appointments converted to career appointments.

S. 1320 also removes the outdated statutory ceiling on the number of permanent Federal employees. This ceiling was set 16 years ago. It was based on 1950 conditions. Today it is impractical and unrealistic in the light of the tremendous growth of our economy and population, and the corresponding increased demand for services. In removing the ceiling Congress will not be relinquishing its control over the size of the Federal bureaucracy. No increased Federal employment should result. The ceiling limits permanent, not total employment. In fact, savings should result because in the past agencies and departments in an effort to meet their needs and still remain under the statutory ceiling have had to resort to more expensive contractor personnel.

S. 1320 is an honest recognition of existing problems and conditions within the structure of the Federal Government. Because it is another effort by this body to render the Federal machinery more efficient and equitable in operation, it merits the support of each Member of this body.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1320, as amended, which was reported unanimously out of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

One of the fundamental purposes of the Civil Service Act of 1883 was to establish a career system in the Federal Government. Under this system, Federal employees have been able to progress in an orderly manner through stages of tenure culminating in permanent status. However, there have been instances where a few employees have been placed in permanent jobs to meet the unusual needs of agencies. Included in this category are TAPER employees, who have had considerable experience and are doing a satisfactory job, but the Civil Service Commission has not found it possible

or necessary to set up registers. Unfortunately, a few thousand of these employees remain in this TAPER status for years without an opportunity to better themselves or provide security for their families.

The Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service has reviewed this problem rather intently for the last few weeks. Let me quote for you just two of many cases that have been brought to our attention:

I have been stuck with a TAPER appointment for 3½ years. A mere drop in the bucket compared to some. I am employed as a Crypto Equipment Operator at ——— Army Depot. Although I have been in the Communications Section longer than most operators, I have no seniority, no promotion opportunities, no transfer rights and no civil service retirement. If we ever have a RIF, I would be the first to go, as most of the other operators were transferred here from other Defense activities with status. I am a TAPER here simply because the Commission has not established a civil service register for "Cryptographic Equipment Operator."

I have been employed at the Veterans' Administration Center in ——— as a Manual Arts Therapist, GS-8, four years this month and I am still classified in a temporary status, simply because there has not been a register. Including my four years in the military, I have eight years credit. Acutely aware of the fact that should there be a reduction-in-force, with my low retention rights, this insecure position has caused me to seriously consider leaving VA for employment where I could find a more secure situation.

The bill before the House today, S. 1320, as amended, provides a solution to this problem. The bill makes available to the employee who has held a TAPER appointment for 3 years, who is doing a good job, and who passes an unassembled examination, an opportunity to obtain career status.

Mr. Speaker, this bill corrects inequities for these Government employees.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1320, which would provide career status for certain temporary Government employees.

The measure has come to the floor with an amendment consisting of substitute text by our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. As thus amended, the legislation would serve two principal purposes. First, it would enable certain Federal employees who are serving in positions in the competitive service under indefinite or temporary appointments, and who complete at least 3 years of service in such positions without a break in service of more than 30 days, to acquire competitive status and to have their appointments converted to career appointments. Second, it would remove the permanent statutory ceiling on the number of permanent Federal employees.

The legislation is clearly designed to correct an inequitable situation, and it has ample precedent in action taken in the past by both Congress and the President. Our committee reports that over two-fifths of the 19,140 Federal personnel who in late 1966 were found working in permanent positions without career status, had been working in the same

jobs for 3 years or longer. When we consider the multitude of employee benefits of which these temporary employees were deprived because of their lack of career status, the urgency of this legislation becomes at once apparent.

I am impressed by the committee statement that this legislation would not be a means of evading the competitive processes of the civil service system. It would only provide what the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission reportedly has called another one-time cleanup. Similar relief provided in the past would tend to substantiate this view.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation deserves our support, and I urge a favorable vote for S. 1320.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1320, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, S. 1320.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISMISSING THE CONTESTED ELECTION CASE OF WYMAN C. LOWE, CONTESTANT, AGAINST FLETCHER THOMPSON, CONTESTEE, FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, AND DENYING PETITION OF WYMAN C. LOWE RELATIVE TO GENERAL ELECTION ON NOVEMBER 8, 1966, IN SAID DISTRICT AND STATE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 541 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 541

Resolved, That the election contest of Wyman C. Lowe, contestant, against Fletcher Thompson, contestee, Fifth Congressional District of the State of Georgia, be dismissed, and that the petition (numbered 75) of Wyman C. Lowe relative to the general election on November 8, 1966, in the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Georgia be denied.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to dismiss an election contest brought against FLETCHER THOMPSON, Representative from the Fifth District of Georgia, by Wyman C. Lowe of Atlanta, Ga., and to deny Mr. Lowe's petition (No. 75) relative to the general election on November 8, 1966,

requesting the House to investigate the right of the gentleman from Georgia to his seat and to declare his election null and void and his seat vacant.

To summarize the facts and the reasons underlying the recommendation of the Committee on House Administration, FLETCHER THOMPSON, the Republican candidate was elected to the seat from the Fifth District of Georgia, defeating his Democratic opponent, Archie Lindsey. His election was challenged under the contested-election law by Wyman C. Lowe, an unsuccessful candidate in the Democratic primary election, whose name was not on the ballot in the general election. It appearing to the Subcommittee on Elections that there was a serious question of Mr. Lowe's standing to bring a contest under the contested-election law, the parties were invited to file briefs and to appear before the subcommittee for oral argument on that question. At the hearing, Mr. Lowe claimed that he was a candidate in the general election by virtue of having conducted a "write-in" campaign. However, he admitted that he had announced his withdrawal from the race a few days before the election and the committee concluded that he was, in fact, not a candidate on election day. In the committee's opinion, the recent precedents, going back to Miller against Kirwan in 1941, indicates that the House regards a noncandidate as lacking the requisite standing to be a contestant under the law because a noncandidate cannot claim a right to the seat. These precedents are cited on page 2 of Report No. 365 accompanying the resolution.

Therefore, in accordance with the precedents, we recommend dismissal of the case on the ground that Mr. Lowe is not a "contestant" for the seat within the meaning of the term as used in the contested-election law.

After the hearing on May 4, Mr. Lowe filed a petition with the Speaker, challenging Mr. THOMPSON's election on the same grounds asserted in the contested-election case, praying that the House investigate the election and declare the election invalid and the seat vacant. This petition was referred to the Committee on House Administration on May 8. It attacks Mr. THOMPSON's election on ground that the nomination of his Democratic opponent was illegal, being contrary to the Georgia Election Code and the rules of the State Democratic Party, and that, since there was no lawful Democratic candidate, the election of Mr. THOMPSON was a nullity. The report of the committee points out that there is no precedent for unseating a Member because of the illegality of his opponent's nomination, even assuming it was illegal, and that the establishment of such a precedent would jeopardize the integrity of congressional elections. If, as petitioner contends, the validity of a Member's election is dependent on the legality of his opponent's nomination, it is not difficult to perceive the potential danger to the integrity of congressional elections. If the House were to find out that there was no lawfully nominated Democratic candidate and to declare the election null and void for that reason, the door would

be open for the party of a losing candidate in a congressional election to impeach the election of the winning candidate by claiming that the election was invalid because the losing candidate had not been nominated in accordance with election laws and party rules.

It should be noted that, prior to the election, Mr. Lowe brought suit against the Democratic nominee and certain election officials, seeking to enjoin Mr. Lindsey's candidacy and ordering the call of a special Democratic primary. This suit was dismissed by the Georgia State court prior to the election.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, was the contestant, Mr. Lowe, under the law at any time a nominee of any recognized political party in the State of Georgia?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman, Mr. Lowe was not. He was a candidate in the primary election, during the summer or fall, prior to the general election, but he was, I believe, third. He was not the nominee of the party at any time.

Mr. HALEY. Of no recognized political party in Georgia?

Mr. ASHMORE. No, sir.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, who chairs this subcommittee, in the opinions he has expressed. I commend him for the fairminded and fairhanded way he handled the hearings, as he always does in these types of contests.

Our subcommittee spent a great deal of time on this case. We gave the contestant, or the alleged contestant, ample opportunity to argue his viewpoint, and it came down to a very simple matter. The alleged contestant, Mr. Lowe, was not a candidate. As the gentleman from South Carolina indicated, Mr. Lowe had been a candidate in the Democratic primary and failed. After the nominee of the Democratic Party withdrew, Mr. Lowe claimed there were some violations of Georgia law with reference to the nomination of the replacement of Mr. Weltner on the Democratic ticket. Those problems with the nomination of the Democratic candidate were carried to court.

There was a dismissal in the Georgia courts of Mr. Lowe's case. The duly authorized Democratic candidate ran against the Republican candidate, Mr. FLETCHER THOMPSON, and there is no contention that Mr. FLETCHER THOMPSON was in any way disqualified by his nomination or that there was any fraud of any other irregularity in the election of Mr. FLETCHER THOMPSON as a Member of this House.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lowe never claimed the right to the seat himself. He simply wanted to have another election.

I would join the gentleman from South Carolina in indicating that whether we base our dismissal in this instance on the

fact—and I believe it is a fact—that Mr. Lowe was not a candidate under the law and he had no standing as a contestant, or whether we base it on the more general grounds in dismissing his petition, we must not open the door to this kind of election contest.

It would open all of us, if we should accept such a contest, to a type of vexatious harassment which certainly should not be permitted. If in any instance we were to permit this type of contest, a party which felt it had no chance would simply have to see to it that there were irregularities in nominating its own candidate. Thereafter it could challenge the election of the candidate who had been duly elected, claiming that the nomination of the defeated candidate was in some way in violation of law.

In this instance there is no question of the qualifications of the Republican candidate who won the election. His nomination was proper.

I strongly support the view of the committee and of our chairman that this case should be dismissed, including both the election contest and the petition which has been filed.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE OF JAMES A. MACKAY, CONTESTANT, AGAINST BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN, CONTESTEE, FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 542 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 542

Resolved, That Benjamin B. Blackburn was duly elected as Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Georgia to the Ninetieth Congress and is entitled to his seat.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to declare that BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN, Representative from the Fourth District of Georgia, was duly elected and is entitled to his seat in the 90th Congress. The question of the final right of the gentleman from Georgia to his seat was referred to the Committee on House Administration by House Resolution 2 adopted on January 10, 1967.

Briefly, the facts are that in the general election last November the incumbent Democratic Representative from the Fourth District of Georgia, James A. Mackay, was defeated in a very close race by the Republican candidate, Mr. BLACKBURN. Voting was conducted by use of

Votomatic vote recorders and punchcard ballots tabulated on computers. Mr. Mackay challenged the election results, claiming that the computers erroneously failed to count about 7,000 votes and that the procedures for duplicating defective ballots were improper. His charges were the subject of a limited investigation by the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1966, which filed a report recommending that Mr. BLACKBURN be made to stand aside at the swearing in of the Members of the 90th Congress and that he not be seated until the election contest could be resolved.

While the matter was before the special committee, Mr. Mackay filed a formal election contest in the House of Representatives under the contested-election law.

On the opening of the 90th Congress, an objection was made to the administration of the oath to Mr. BLACKBURN and he was asked by the Speaker to stand aside while the other Members were sworn. Thereafter, pursuant to House Resolution 2, he was conditionally seated and the election contest was referred to the Committee on House Administration to determine, in the words of said resolution, "the final right of Benjamin B. Blackburn to a seat in the 90th Congress."

While the contested-election case was in progress in the House, a group of Mr. Mackay's supporters filed suit against Mr. BLACKBURN in a Georgia State court, challenging his election under the Georgia Election Code of 1964. This litigation was terminated on March 30, 1967, by the Georgia supreme court's denial of a writ of certiorari to the Georgia court of appeals which, on January 25, 1967, had held in favor of Mr. BLACKBURN on the key issue in the case. In short, they adopted Mr. BLACKBURN's contention that the election officials had been correct in programming the computers to reject ballots where the voter had punched out the scored block for either "straight Democratic ticket" or "straight Republican ticket" and also punched out the scored block for the congressional candidate of the opposing party. The court ruled that these were invalid "over-votes" and not valid "split ticket votes," as claimed by Mr. Mackay.

As a result of the adverse court decision, Mr. Mackay withdrew his election contest in the House by letter to the Speaker dated April 13, 1967. Accordingly, the committee has concluded that Mr. BLACKBURN should be declared to be entitled to his seat and urges adoption of House Resolution 542.

If the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] will permit me to, I would like to yield for 1 minute to our colleague from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was named by the Speaker to serve on the Special Elections Committee on Campaign Expenditures which had its existence from the general election of 1966 until the organization of this Congress in January. As a part of my responsibility serving on that committee I was the Member of Congress who objected to the seating of the gentleman from Georgia

[Mr. BLACKBURN] at the time that the 90th Congress was organized. I felt since the election was in doubt and was under contest by Mr. James Mackay that it was my responsibility to interpose this objection. In the light of the fact that Mr. Mackay withdrew his objection by his letter of April 13, 1967, I am happy to join with the subcommittee, that is, Mr. ASHMORE's subcommittee, of the Committee on House Administration, of which I am also a member, and to endorse the recommendation of that committee.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I also join in the committee decision in this instance to dismiss the contest brought by Mr. Mackay against the incumbent contestee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN]. It should be emphasized that at this stage Mr. Mackay has requested the withdrawal of his contest, so there is really no issue left to argue about.

I think there is one point, however, that should be made in this debate which affects all of us in the possibility of election contests in our own districts in the future. We must move to clarify the whole procedure of election contests in the interim between the election date and the opening of a new Congress. In that period the jurisdiction lies to a degree in the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures. As a practical matter, the ultimate decision for investigating and determining election contests rests with the new Congress and with the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration. We have had in the past confusion in election contest cases. The contest in some instances has felt he had complied with the law by giving notice of contest to the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures and failed to give notice under the law to the Clerk of the House and the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it seems unnecessary that we have two such subcommittees operating with overlapping jurisdiction.

We have moved to a degree to provide that the membership of the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures will be the same as the membership of the House Subcommittee on Elections.

Perhaps this would be a solution. In any event I believe this Congress should move to try to eliminate the overlapping and confusion that exists in the present law between the jurisdictions of these two committees. It caused some difficulty in this instance. The Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures spent considerable time debating its proper jurisdiction, and the special committee ultimately, by a divided vote, recommended that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN] not be seated on opening day. There was considerable difference of opinion as to the proper jurisdiction of the Elections Subcommittee as distinguished from the Campaign Expenditures Special Committee in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we could move to eliminate any possibility of this type of confusion in the future.

Mr. Speaker, one other point should be made. It is clear from the history and the contest that was brought by Mr. Mackay, that there were serious difficulties experienced with the Votomatic voting machines and the cards that were used and which were punched out by the voter. In many instances they apparently did not go through the machine properly.

There were difficulties in counting the ballots. Because of this there were a great many allegations, brought by Mr. Mackay, with reference to this subject matter. They were not crucial turning points in the determination of this case.

Mr. Speaker, we did not go into these allegations in any great detail in our subcommittee. We do not feel that it is our obligation as a committee of the Congress of the United States to investigate the relative merits of Votomatic voting machines and other machine. But, certainly, when we are dealing with a problem of election contests and are trying in some instances to have a recount of the vote, we must be concerned with the automatic equipment which is used that might make it impossible to have an accurate recount, where such a recount may be indicated, as determined by our subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, the difficulties were numerous with the Votomatic machines in this election.

Another aspect of the election was the difficulty in controlling the Votomatic cards. Allegations were made to the effect that some of them were left out in the corridors overnight and then put through the machines, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, we do not pass judgment as a subcommittee, and as a committee we do not ask Congress to pass upon these allegations. But we do call attention to the fact that these allegations were made and that there appears to be some substance to the allegations that great difficulties were experienced with reference to this particular type of equipment.

It is very clear, however, that the decision of the Georgia courts to the effect that Mr. BLACKBURN won this election under the laws of the State of Georgia was correct and that the gentleman is surely qualified to be seated.

Mr. Speaker, the committee is unanimous in recommending the dismissal of this election contest.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I certainly appreciate and thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] for joining in the endorsement of the resolution which has come from the Committee on House Administration.

I want to say on my own behalf that I am certainly grateful for the consideration shown to me by the leadership of the House and by the Members of the House during this period when this matter was under debate.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Declaring that Benjamin B. Blackburn was duly elected as Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Georgia to the 90th Congress and is entitled to his seat."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM UNDER ISRAELI ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal in recent days about the restoration of the status quo ante in Jerusalem. In a speech some days ago, I predicted that Arabs of Jerusalem, no less than Jews, would be pleased by the results of the unification of Jerusalem under Israeli administration. The press reports since that time—and I speak of every reliable press source—confirm that this is the case. Jerusalem is free again, to Arabs, Christians, and Jews. What is holy to all three is receiving careful attention and the people of the former Arab sector are being treated with generosity and brotherhood.

I cannot help but contrast this, Mr. Speaker, to the late administration of the old section of Jerusalem under the Jordanian Government. A story which appeared in the New York Times on July 4, a dispatch from Agence-France-Presse, tells of how the Jordanians, during their 20-year rule in Jerusalem, removed gravestones from the Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives, one of the holiest cemeteries in the Judaic world, and used them, literally, to pave the road to Jericho. The inscriptions on the stones were still visible to the reporter who wrote the story. I trust that every Member of this body is as outraged as I by this barbaric conduct on the part of the Jordanians.

Mr. Speaker, one might also have noted a story in the New York Times of July 9, telling of the damage the Jordanians did to the highly regarded Rockefeller Archeological Museum in Jerusalem. The damage to the museum was slovenliness; to the cemetery, it was deliberate sacrilege. Is there any civilized human who thinks that the Arab government of Jordan deserves to have restored to it the honor of taking care of the holy places of three great religions? I regard such an idea as folly. In my view, Jordan has forfeited its rights in Jerusalem forevermore.

Never again, Mr. Speaker, can such gross irresponsibility be tolerated. Premier Eshkol has indicated that Israel would be amenable to the presence of some international guard of the holy places of Jerusalem. I favor such a symbolic detachment. What we must never countenance, however—not for a min-

ute—is a return to the way things were before last June 5.

I include the full text of the July 4 article from the Times and the relevant paragraphs of the July 9 article:

JORDAN DESECRATED A JEWISH CEMETERY

JERUSALEM, July 3 (Agence France-Presse).—Many gravestones removed from the Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives were used to build Jordanian Army Camps at Al Azariya and Sur Bahir.

The Mount of Olives, which for centuries had been the burial ground for the Jerusalem Jewish community, was occupied by Jordan after the 1948 war and had been inaccessible to Jews until Israeli forces seized Jordanian Jerusalem June 7.

Newsmen who toured the camp, on the road to Jericho, saw dozens of gravestones, their inscriptions still legible, in walls and flooring.

The Minister of Religious Affairs, Dr. Zerah Wahrhaftig, who was on the tour, called the sacrilege deliberate. He said that by such acts Jordan had proved unworthy to be a custodian of holy places.

ISRAEL REPAIRING RAVAGED MUSEUM—BUILDING USED AS A FORTRESS GETS READY FOR VISITORS

(By James Feron)

JERUSALEM, July 8.—An Israeli workman spent this week removing the plaster that had long concealed the chiseled Hebrew signs on the walls of the Palestine Archeological Museum in the former Jordanian sector of Jerusalem.

The three languages of the British mandate—English, Arabic and Hebrew—had been used when the handsome stone building, familiarly known as the Rockefeller Museum, came into use in the middle nineteenth century. The Rockefeller family donated funds for the museum in 1927 but stipulated that it should not bear the Rockefeller name.

For the 19 years of Jordanian operation the Hebrew lettering had been hidden, plastered in where it was etched into the stone, hidden elsewhere with cardboard or display cases.

Staff members of the Israel Museum, whose archeological department is assuming control, have been removing the rubble of war to prepare one of the best known of Middle Eastern museums for an expected rush of visitors.

MUSEUM BECAME FORTRESS

Jordanian soldiers had used the fortress-like museum as a military position. It was one of the last buildings to fall before the Old City walls, which are across the street, were breached on June 7.

The signs of battle are everywhere, and some will last for some time. Most of the windows are broken. Shrapnel holes punctured the ceiling and walls, and new cracks have been made in ancient pots and jars.

Some ancient glass items spun 180 degrees during the shelling. They remained intact but their showcases splintered.

Dr. Avraham Biran, director of the Government antiquities department, said that it would cost about \$80,000 to make repairs.

AVOIDING WATER POLLUTION IN NORTHEAST TEXAS—REMARKS OF FRANKLIN JONES, SR.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished constituent, Mr. Franklin Jones, Sr., a prominent east Texas attorney, has shared my interest and concern for the lakes, rivers, and streams of northeast Texas for many years. As president of the Cypress Valley Navigation District, he has watched with particular concern the water problems resulting from industrial and population growth in many areas of our Nation, and has shown great foresight in alerting the people of the First Congressional District to the need for comprehensive planning to protect our waterways. Excerpts from Mr. Jones' recent address to the Marion County Chamber of Commerce were cited in an editorial in the Marshall News Messenger, July 2, and I enter this editorial in the RECORD:

CLEAN WATER

Speaking before the Marion County Chamber of Commerce last April, Franklin Jones Sr., focused public attention on a subject that is seldom considered in Northeast Texas—water pollution.

Our streams, rivers and lakes are clean, we say, and free of pollution. That's a problem for the big cities, we think.

Jones, however, sounded the alarm in noting this area's lack of industrial growth in bygone years may have been a blessing in disguise. But he pointed out that this region is now beginning to grow industrially, with possibilities unlimited, and that new industries should install pollution control devices, keeping the water free of pollution.

"Had Northeast Texas undergone an industrial boom several years ago, it would now be attempting to eradicate the pollution problem as other areas are," Jones said. "Now as industry comes to our land, we can take precautions to keep our waters clean," he continued.

So two months ago, Jones, president of the Cypress Valley Navigation District was bringing attention to the pollution problem in Northeast Texas. The visit to Texas of the President's Water Pollution Control Advisory Board has now served to focus public attention on this very important problem of this generation: How can we assure this and succeeding generations of Texas an adequate supply of potable water?

Texans have thought big in many fields, but have betrayed only a limited vision on the subject of water supplies until recent years. Population growth and industrialization have forced a complete reappraisal of the question of water supply and distribution. The first tentative steps toward major redistribution of water supplies through interbasin transfer have already been taken. As with most beginnings the extent and the nature of the ultimate plan is still uncertain.

In any comprehensive water plan for the state, though, the question of water pollution assumes paramount importance. For wise use and reuse of water is essential to a successful program. This means that a municipality or an industry which uses water must return it to a river system without having reduced substantially its quality.

The responsibility for pollution must be shared. There is more than enough blame to go around. It will not do to just blame industry for all our pollution woes. Municipalities, through sewage and storm sewer facilities, remain one of the most troublesome offenders of all. The people are as much to blame as business and industry and share responsibility for abating pollution.

We in Texas are barely on the threshold of revolutionary developments in water treatment. Primary treatment is no longer good enough. Secondary and tertiary treatment may be required in many industries. Some industries may indeed be forced out of

business if adequate treatment of waste waters cannot be developed. The days of "to hell with the downstream users" are over.

Water treatment in Texas is going to be a tremendously expensive business. Tens of millions of dollars will be required for research to develop new processes or improve those now used. But there is no escaping the necessity for adequate treatment of water before it is returned to a river or stream. The health of our people as well as the economic well-being of our state, as Jones pointed out, demand it.

BIG CORPORATIONS DOMINATE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, over the course of many years in the Congress, I am strongly impressed with the great contribution of a few outstanding thinkers who combine a dedication to our democratic principles with a keen awareness of economic and social realities. One of this distinguished group is Prof. J. Kenneth Galbraith of Harvard who, over the many years, has shown a great capacity for casting his bright light on the society around us and showing, in sharp focus, what the facts are and, even more important, how existing facts often deviate from our hopes and expectations. Unlike many other thinkers in and out of academic life, professors like J. Kenneth Galbraith are not blinded by their own preconceptions or misconceptions. They are accurate and brilliant observers of the world around them.

Professor Galbraith's latest contribution to thinking on public policy is a new book entitled "The New Industrial State." It deals with a matter that vitally concerns all of us here in the Congress—namely, the role of the huge corporation in our society. It is his thesis that our economy is dominated by some 500 huge corporations which are controlled not so much by stockholders as by their own managerial officials. And their power and size frees them from their reliance on the traditional market economy. They raise their own money through pricing and goods high enough to permit capital accumulation and they are powerful enough to manipulate demand in the market.

Of particular concern to us in the Congress is his observation of how weak our antitrust enforcement has proven in reaching and coping with this growing dominance of the big corporation. I do not agree with Professor Galbraith's pessimism about the total ineffectiveness of antitrust laws. They continue to be our main hope and bulwark to stem a dangerous trend toward monopoly. But I think he has done a great service in exposing existing weaknesses. It is my fervent hope that this excellent book will be read widely by those of us in the Congress who are becoming more and more concerned by the merger trend and with the imperfections of existing antimonopoly laws. In my opinion, we must strengthen these laws to preserve

what is left of our free competitive economy.

The book, of course, is not primarily a treatise on antimonopoly provisions. It undertakes to analyze broad trends in our industrial society and, as such, it will be read by many people concerned with public policy. At the same time, it has particular relevance for antimonopoly policy. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and all members of the public who are interested in public policy.

I submit for the RECORD a summary of some of Professor Galbraith's conclusions on these matters which appeared in an article in the *Atlantic Monthly* for May 1967. Part of this article follows:

MARKET PLANNING AND THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

(By John Kenneth Galbraith)

In fact since Adam and as a matter of settled doctrine since Adam Smith, the businessman has been assumed to be subordinate to the market. In last month's article I showed that modern highly technical processes and products and associated requirements of capital and time lead inevitably to planning—to the management of markets by those who supply them. It is technology, not ideology, that brings this result. The market serves admirably to supply simple things. But excellent as it may be on muskets, it is very bad on missiles. And not even the supply of components for the modern automobile can be trusted to the market; neither is it safe to assume that the market will absorb the necessary production at a remunerative price. There must be planning here as well.

The principal planning instrument in the modern economy is the large corporation. Within broad limits, it determines what the consumer shall have and at what price he shall have it. And it foresees the need for and arranges the necessary supply of capital, machinery, and materials.

The modern corporation is the direct descendant of the entrepreneur. This has kept us from seeing it in its new role. Had the corporation been an outgrowth of the state, which we readily associate with planning, we would not be in doubt. The modern corporation has, in fact, moved into a much closer association with the state than most of us imagine. And its planning activities are extensively and systematically supplemented by those of the state.

Let us consider first the regulation of prices in the modern economy and the means by which public behavior is accommodated to plan. Here, I should warn, we encounter some of the more deeply entrenched folk myths of our time, including a certain vested interest in error on the part of both economists and businessmen. If one takes faith in the market away from the economist, he is perilously barren of belief. So, he defends the market to defend his stock of knowledge. And the large corporate enterprise needs the concept of the market as a cover for the authority it exercises. It has great influence over our material existence and also our beliefs. But accepted doctrine holds that in all of its behavior it is subordinate to the market. It is merely an automation responding to instructions therefrom. Any complaint as to the use or misuse of power can be met by the answer that there is none.

Control of prices is an intrinsic feature of all planning. And it is made urgent by the special vagaries of the market for highly technical products. In the formally planned economies—that of the Soviet Union, for example—price control is a forthright function of the state, although there has been some

tendency in recent times to allow some of the power of prices to devolve on the socialist firm. In the Western-type economies, comprehensive systems of price control have come about by evolution and adaptation. Nobody willed them. They were simply required by circumstance.

The power to set minimum industrial prices exists whenever a small number of firms share a market. The innocent at the universities have long been taught that small numbers of firms in the market—oligopoly, as it is known—accord to sellers the same power in imperfect form that has anciently been associated with monopoly. The principal difference is the imperfect nature of this monopoly power. It does not permit the exploitation of the consumer in quite such efficient fashion as was possible under the patents of monopoly accorded by the first Elizabeth to her favorites or by John D. Rockefeller to himself.

But in fact, the modern market shared by a few large firms is combined, in one of the more disconcerting contradictions of economic theory, with efficient production, expansive output, and prices that are generally thought rather favorable to the public. The consequences of oligopoly (few sellers) are greatly condemned in principle as being like those of monopoly but greatly approved in practice. Professor Paul Samuelson, the most distinguished of contemporary economists, warns in his famous textbook on economics that "to reduce the imperfections of competition" (by which he means markets consisting of a small number of large firms or oligopoly) "a nation must struggle perpetually and must ever maintain vigilance." Since American markets are now dominated by a very few small number of very large firms, the struggle, obviously, has been a losing one and is now lost. But the result is that the economy functions very well. Samuelson himself concludes that man-hour efficiency in the United States "can hardly help but grow at the rate of three per cent or more, even if we do not rouse ourselves." A similar conflict between the inefficiency of oligopoly and the efficiency of an economy composed thereof is present in every well-regarded economic textbook. Samuelson agrees that technology and associated capital use are what improve efficiency. But these are precisely what require that there be planning and price control.

And here we have the answer. Prices in the modern economy are controlled not for the purposes of monopolistic exploitation. They are controlled for purposes of planning. This comes about as an effortless consequence of the development of that economy. Modern industrial planning both requires and rewards great size. This means, in turn, that a comparatively small number of large firms will divide the production of most (though not all) products. Each, as a matter of ordinary prudence, will act with full consideration of its own needs and the common need. Each must have control of its own prices. Each will recognize this to be a requirement of others. Each will foreswear any action, and notably any sanguinary or competitive price-cutting, which would be prejudicial to the common interest in price control. This control is not difficult either to achieve or to maintain. Additionally, one firm's prices are another firm's costs. So, stability in prices means stability in costs.

The fact of control is far more important than the precise level at which prices are established. In 1964 in the United States, the big automobile companies had profits on their sales ranging from 5 percent to over 10 percent. There was security against collapse of prices and earnings for firms at either level. Planning was possible at either level of return. All firms could function satisfactorily. But none could have functioned had the price of a standard model fluctuated, depending on whim and reaction to the current

novelties, from, say, \$1800 to \$3600, with steel, glass, chrome, plastics, paint, tires, stereo music, and labor moving over a similar range.

However, the level of prices is not unimportant. And from time to time, in response to major changes in cost—often when the renegotiation of a wage contract provides a common signal to all firms in the industry—prices must be changed. The prices so established will reflect generally the goals of those who guide the enterprise, not of the owners but of those who make the decisions. Security of earnings will be a prime objective. This is necessary for autonomy—for freedom from interference by shareholders and creditors. The next most important goal will be the growth of the firm. This is almost certainly more important than maximum profits. The professional managers and technicians who direct and guide the modern firm do not themselves get the profits. These accrue mainly to the shareholders. But the managers and technicians do get the benefits of expansion. This brings the prestige which is associated with a larger firm and which is associated with growth as such. And as a very practical matter, it opens up new executive jobs, new opportunities for promotion, and better excuses for higher pay.

Prices, accordingly, will be set with a view to attracting customers and expanding sales. When price control is put in the context of planning, the contradiction between expectation of monopolistic exploitation and expectation of efficiency, which pervades all textbook discussion, disappears. Planning calls for stability of prices and costs, security of return, and expansion. With none of these is the consumer at odds. Reality has, by its nature, advantages of internal consistency.

I must mention here one practical consequence of this argument, namely, its bearing on legal action against monopoly. There is a remarkable discrimination in the way such measures, notably the antitrust laws, are now applied. A great corporation wielding vast power over its markets is substantially immune. It does not appear to misuse its power; accordingly, it is left alone. And in any case, to declare all large corporations illegal is, in effect, to declare the modern economy illegal. That is rather impractical—and would damage any President's consensus. But if two small firms making the same product seek to unite, this corporate union will be meticulously scrutinized. And very possibly, it will be forbidden. This may be so even though the merged firm is minuscule in size or market power as compared with the giant that is already a giant.

The explanation is that the modern antimonopoly and antitrust laws are substantially a charade. Their function is not to prevent exploitation of the public. If great size and great market power led to such exploitation, our case would long since have been hopeless. Their function is to persuade people, liberal economists in particular, that the market still exists, for here is the state vigilantly standing guard. It does so by exempting the large firms and swatting those that seek to become larger.

The French, Germans, and Japanese either do not have or do not enforce such laws. That is because they are not impelled similarly to worship at the altar of the market. They quietly accept the logic of planning and its requirements in size for effective market control. There is no indication that they suffer in consequence.

When prices for a particular product are set by a few large firms, there is little danger of price-cutting. This part of the control is secure. There does remain a danger of uncontrolled price increases.

In particular, when a few large firms bargain with a strong union, conflict can be avoided by acceding to union demands. And there is not much incentive to resist. There

is a common understanding among the firms that all will raise their prices to compensate for such a settlement. If demand is strong enough to keep the economy near full employment, it will be strong enough to make such price increases feasible. These price increases, in turn, set in motion demands for further wage increases. Thus, the familiar upward spiral of wages and prices proceeds. And this too is prejudicial to planning. The individual firm, moreover, cannot prevent such price increases; they are beyond its control as a planning unit.

So here, more and more we follow the practice of the formally planned economies. We rely on the state to set maximum wages and prices. In the United States as in Britain this is done with great caution, circumspection, and diffidence, somewhat in the manner of a Victorian spinster viewing an erotic statute. Such action is held to be unnatural and temporary. Economists accord it little or no standing in economic policy. They say it interferes with the market. Unions also dislike it: they say it interferes with free collective bargaining. Businessmen disapprove: they say it interferes with their natural freedom of decision on prices. But what everyone opposes in principle, all advanced countries end up doing in practice. The answer once more is clear. In a market economy, such ceilings would be unnecessary. But they are an indispensable counterpart of economic planning and of the minimum price control that already exists.

This price- and wage-setting by the state could be dispensed with by having such a shortage of demand that it would be impossible for firms to raise prices and unions to raise wages. That is to say, we could do without such controls by rehabilitating the market for labor and industrial products. It would not then be possible to raise wages in response to prices or prices in response to wages. But that would mean unemployment or greater uncertainty of employment, and it would mean greater market uncertainty for producers—for businessmen. Despite everyone's affection for the market, almost no one wants these results. So we have strong demand, small unemployment, reliable purchases, and the maximum price and wage controls that these require. And we try to avert our eyes from this result. It would be simpler were we to recognize that we have planning and that this control is an indispensable aspect.

This leads to another subject, the management of what people buy at the controlled prices.

The key to the management of demand is effective influence over the purchases of final consumers. The latter include both private individuals and the state. If all such purchases are under effective control, there will then be a reliable demand throughout the system for raw materials, parts, machinery, and other items going into the ultimate product. If the demand for its automobiles is secure, an automobile company can accord its suppliers the certainty of long-term contracts for their planning. And, even in the absence of such contracts, there will still be a reliable and predictable flow of orders. How, then, are the individual consumers managed?

As so often happens, change in modern industrial society has made possible what change requires. The need to control consumer behavior arises from the exigencies of planning. Planning, in turn, is made necessary by extensive use of advanced technology and the time and capital this requires. This is an efficient way of producing goods; the result is a very large volume of production. As a further consequence in the economically advanced countries, goods that serve elementary physical sensation—that prevent hunger, protect against cold, provide shelter, suppress pain—include only a small and diminishing part of what people consume. Only a few goods serve needs that are made

known to the individual by the palpable discomfort or pain that is experienced in their absence. Most are enjoyed because of some psychic or aesthetic response to their possession or use. They give the individual a sense of personal achievement; they accord him a feeling of equality with his neighbors; they make him feel superior; or they divert his mind from thought or the absence of thought; or they promote or satisfy sexual aspiration; or they promise social acceptability; or they enhance his subjective feelings of health, well-being, and adequate peristalsis; or they are thought to contribute to personal beauty.

Thus it comes about that as the industrial system develops to where it has need for planning and the management of the consumer that this requires, we find it serving wants which are psychological in origin. And these are admirably subject to appeal to the psyche. Hence they can be managed. A man whose stomach is totally empty cannot be persuaded that his need is for entertainment. Physical discomfort will tell him he needs food more. But though a hungry man cannot be persuaded to choose between bread and a circus, a well-fed man can. And he can be persuaded to choose between different circuses and different foods.

By giving a man a ration card or distributing to him the specific commodities he is to consume, the individual can be required to consume in accordance with plan. But this is an onerous form of control, and it is ill adapted to differences in personality. In advanced industrial societies, it is considered acceptable only in times of great stress or for the very poor. (Even in the formally planned economies—the Soviet Union and the Eastern European states—the ration card is a manifestation of failure.) It is easier, and if less precise, still sufficient, to manage people by persuasion rather than by fiat.

Though advertising will be thought of as the central feature of this persuasion, and is certainly important, it is but a part of a much larger apparatus for the management of demand. Nor does this consist alone in devising a sales strategy for a particular product. It often means devising a product, or features of a product, around which a sales strategy can be built. Product design, model change, packaging, and even performance reflect the need to provide what are called strong selling points. They are as much a part of the process of demand management as the advertising campaign.

The first step in this process, generally speaking, is to ensure a loyal or automatic corps of customers. This is known as building customer loyalty and brand recognition. If successful, it means that the firm has a stable body of customers who are secure against any large-scale defection. Being thus reliable and predictable, they allow planning.

A purely defensive strategy will not, however, suffice. In line with the goals of its directing organization, the firm will want to expand sales. And such effort is necessary to hold a given position. The same will be true of others. Out of these efforts, from firms that have the resources to play the game (another advantage of size), comes a crude equilibrating process which accords to each participant a reasonably reliable share of the market.

Specifically, when a firm is enjoying a steady patronage by its existing customers and recruiting new ones at what seems a satisfactory rate, the existing strategy for consumer management—advertising, selling methods, product design—will be considered satisfactory. The firm will not quarrel with success. However, if sales are stationary or slipping, this will call for a change in selling methods—in advertising, product design, or even in the product itself. Testing and experiment are possible. And sooner or later, a formula providing a suitable response is obtained. This will lead, in turn, to countering

action by the firms that are then failing to make gains. And out of this process a rough but reliable equilibrium between the participants is achieved.

It does not always work. There are Edsels. But it is the everyday assumption of those who engage in management of demand that if sales of a product are slipping, a new selling formula can be found that will correct the situation. By and large, the assumption is justified. Means, in other words, can almost always be found to keep the exercise of consumer discretion within safe or planned limits.

Management of the consumer on the scale that I have just outlined requires that those be some comprehensive, repetitive, and compelling communication between the managers of demand and those who are managed. It must be possible to win the attention of those who are being managed for considerable periods of time without great effort on their part.

Technology, once again, solved the problem it created. Coincidentally with rising mass incomes came first radio and then television. In their capacity to hold effortless interest, their accessibility over the entire cultural spectrum, and their independence of any educational qualification, these were superbly suited to mass persuasion. Television was especially serviceable. Not since the invention of speech has any medium of communication appeared which is so readily accommodated to the whole spectrum of mental capacity.

There is an insistent tendency among social scientists, including economists, to think that any institution which features singing commercials, shows the human intestinal tract in full or impaired operation, equates the effortless elimination of human whiskers with the greatest happiness of man, and implies that exceptional but wholesome opportunities for seduction are associated with a particular make of automobile is inherently trivial. This is a great mistake. The modern industrial system is profoundly dependent on this art. What is called progress makes it increasingly so.

And the management of demand so provided is in all respects an admirably subtle arrangement in social design. It works not on the individual but on the mass. An individual of will and determination can, in principle, contract out from under its influence. This being the case, no individual compulsion in the purchase of any product can ever be established. To all who object there is a natural answer: You are at liberty to leave! Yet there is no danger that enough people will ever assert this choice—will ever leave—to impair the management of mass behavior.

MAYOR ANGELO J. SARUBBI OF NORTH BERGEN, N.J., CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

Mr. DANIELS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, local government is the cornerstone of our democratic society. Upon the efforts of our local officials rests the very fabric of the American system of government.

All too often, however, officials who serve at this level of government are the targets of criticism if for no better reason than the fact that they are closest to the citizens they serve. Because they are so accessible, it is very easy for the out-

raged citizen to take out his frustrations by denouncing those public officials entrusted with the operations of municipal government.

On the other hand, it is a rare event when mayors and councilmen receive the praise which is due them when they have given outstanding service. Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege and a high honor for me to call to the attention of all Members of this House an honor which has been bestowed upon a very distinguished constituent of mine.

The Honorable Angelo J. Sarubbi has served the town of North Bergen, N.J., for many years with great distinction and since 1955 has been a member of the town commission, and is now serving his second term as mayor of North Bergen.

It is with a great sense of pride that I insert at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Hudson Dispatch, a leading newspaper in the 14th Congressional District, which tells of Mayor Sarubbi's selection as "Citizen of the Year" by the North Hudson chapter of UNICO, a highly esteemed service organization.

Mayor Sarubbi is an old friend of mine and I would like to extend to him and to his beloved father, John Sarubbi, and to all members of the close-knit Sarubbi family, my own personal congratulations. The article follows:

WILL HONOR SARUBBI—HE'S UNICO "MAN OF THE YEAR"

North Bergen Mayor Angelo J. Sarubbi has been selected as "Citizen of the Year" by North Hudson Chapter UNICO National, it was announced yesterday.

The announcement was made by President August Orlando and the selections were made by a special committee of past presidents of the service organization headed by Frank De Socio.

Mayor Sarubbi will be honored at a dinner-dance to be preceded by a cocktail party on Saturday, Nov. 4, at Skyline Cabana Club in Jersey City.

Previous North Hudson citizens to receive the award are West New York Mayor John R. Armellino, Union City Mayor William V. Musto, recently named North Bergen School Board Trustee Alfred V. Failla, Hudson Dispatch Managing Editor Thomas R. Oliver, late Editor of Hudson Dispatch John Mitchell, Commissioner John E. Otis of West New York, Principal Joseph Covello of North Bergen High School, and the late John F. Cahir of Weehawken.

In announcing the award, Orlando praised Sarubbi, who was reelected a commissioner on May 9, for his part in bettering North Bergen community life. He also singled out Sarubbi's work with North Bergen's youth.

Sarubbi first entered North Bergen public life in 1949 when he was appointed secretary to the board of adjustment. He served in this post until 1955, when he was first selected mayor. He has been a member of the town's governing body ever since.

He was born in West New York on Feb. 28, 1916, and was graduated from St. Joseph's Elementary School and Memorial High School in that municipality. Sarubbi is also a graduate of Pratt Institute in Brooklyn.

Now a successful building contractor, he lives with his wife, the former Mildred Thomson and two sons, John 25, and William 18, at 428 74th st., North Bergen.

In an interview, Orlando said that Sarubbi deserved the award because he is an "outstanding citizen of Hudson County in general." The work with youth that Sarubbi is praised for in particular, Orlando added, "the playgrounds that have been built with

his backing throughout North Bergen and the track that is being built in North Hudson park now."

UNICO is a service organization whose North Hudson branch was started 13 years ago. Besides other charities, the group gives out one college scholarship a year and it has chosen a "man of the year" for the last 10 years. The proceeds from the "man of the year" dinners go to help pay for the scholarships.

BRING TO TRIAL, NASSER, THE NO. 1 WAR CRIMINAL OF OUR DAY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there will be no peace in the Middle East until several things occur—and they must occur practically simultaneously.

First. Peace treaties must be consummated between the Arab States and Israel as part of which there must be agreement as to the geographic boundaries of the countries involved. Peace treaties necessarily require as a condition of their execution full recognition of the political existence and sovereignty of each party.

Second. Acknowledgment by all and guarantees by the international community of the right of all to peaceful transit without interference of the Suez Canal, the Gulf of Aqaba, and the Strait of Tiran.

Third. Resettlement of the refugees.

The delegates in the U.N. have been talking about this for weeks. Unfortunately, the talk emanating from the Arabs and their supporters has been false, virtuperative, irrelevant, intransigent, steeped in hate and thus promising more war than peace.

How do we make some progress away from war and toward peace?

Let us take a lesson from World War II and its aftermath.

As a result of the Hitlerian atrocities we set up the Nuremberg trials and the pattern thus set has been consistently followed in arresting and prosecuting war criminals.

The Arab war criminals, led by Nasser, have learned nothing from those trials. I say let us teach them.

We should set up a new war crimes court. The first culprit to be tried should be Abdel Gamal Nasser.

Ever since taking over the Government of Egypt and its successor, the United Arab Republic, he has been urging the annihilation of the Israelis and the destruction of the State of Israel. His incitement of hatred, his training of terrorists and infiltrators was and is for the soul purpose of killing the inhabitants of an entire nation, a duly and fully recognized member of the family of nations. His last massive but abortive attempt was for the sole purpose of fulfilling his threats to destroy that entire nation.

The proof of this foul and unprovoked conduct on Nasser's part is spread across the pages of history and is indisputable.

The last conflict was instigated and brought about primarily by Nasser. The responsibility for every death, every wound, every damage to property, is his.

He should be brought before an International Court of Justice and tried for his villainous misconduct. In the calm atmosphere of such a court, the entire record should be exposed. Let him dare to deny his own statements.

Regardless of any punishment that may be meted out to him, once his nefarious actions are made known to the Arab masses, they will reject him and his dastardly false propaganda. When they learn that the billions of dollars wasted on armaments could have been wisely spent to improve their economic condition, they will respond with demands for permanent peace.

Law, order, and justice can prevail among nations only when their leaders believe in and practice obedience to right.

INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONGO

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the distressing news comes to us that three U.S. Air Force planes and accompanying paratrooper guards have been sent to the Congo to shore up the forces of President Joseph D. Mobutu.

This is a dangerous situation, and we might be asking for real trouble, because the commitment of even a token force of Americans could well be an invitation to full-scale involvement. We need but think back on how our involvement mushroomed in Vietnam, starting with the assignment of a few mechanics in 1954 and escalating to an assignment of some 450,000 troops today. And even now there is a call for another 100,000 or more American troops in this area.

A wholesale involvement in the Congo—on top of our already heavy commitment in Vietnam—would place a terrible burden on our American manpower and resources. All of this raises the question of just how long America can play the role of "policeman of the world."

What if some form of trouble were to break out in South America, in India, in South Korea? Would we rush American men and materials to those trouble spots in an effort to straighten things out with a heavy cost of American men and materials?

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for a serious reassessment of our foreign policy against the background of our available human and material resources. The question is this: Even if the role of "policeman of the world" were a desirable one, would we have the men and materials to back it up?

We are a rich country, but we are not wealthy in manpower. Our population figure becomes token when compared with the heavy population statistics of Asia and Africa. While our material resources are plentiful, they do not by any means carry any built-in insurance against exhaustion.

Confusion throughout the world centers in a conflict of political philosophies and ideologies, even as in the case of the current troubles in the Congo. We are deeply involved in Southeast Asia in a sharp conflict with Communist forces, and all the while these forces threaten new outbreaks in Thailand, South Korea, and other parts of the world. One cannot help but be concerned that this might be a long-range design of communism to bleed America white, draining off her manpower and materials into carefully contrived trouble spots throughout the world.

It is disconcerting to observe that on March 1, 1966, the official Chinese Communist Party newspaper, *People's Daily* told its readers:

United States . . . can be destroyed piece by piece, once it is split up. Everything can be split up into its parts, and so can United States imperialism, even though it is strong and powerful.

The Communist newspaper went on to explain that wars like the one in Vietnam stretch out U.S. power, weaken the Americans and make them vulnerable. It then added:

If some of the world's people (meaning the Communist revolutionaries) strike at its head and others at its feet, the divided United States imperialism can be destroyed piece by piece.

What, then, Mr. Speaker, are we doing to guard against this evil eventuality, whether it be in the Congo, Vietnam, or some other trouble spot of the world? Apparently nothing, because every time there is an eruption in some part of the world, Uncle Sam puts on his police uniform, picks up his nightstick, and rushes to the place of disorder.

Mr. Speaker, the world is too big and has too many trouble spots for America to act as a world policeman.

The Congo is a point in order. What obligation do we have there? Why should we be committed with our men and materials in that area? Is there any good reason why we should invite the sacrifice of American lives on this continent?

Is it not about time we put a stop to trying to act as a lone policeman on a vast world beat and, instead, confine our police activities to what we can afford in men and materials—and what, in our national interest, are bona fide obligations?

WIRETAP BAN GOES TOO FAR

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the problems of crime, organized criminal activity, and law enforcement continue to mount. The people are demanding that Congress prepare new and stronger laws to deal with the Nation's unprecedented spiraling crime rate. But no matter how strong, no matter how carefully drawn, no matter how well developed new laws may be, Congress only legislates. It takes enthusiasm and dedication at the law-enforce-

ment level to turn our laws into effective tools to combat crime nationwide. Law enforcement requires more than laws, studies, or commissions. It requires cooperation among the legislative, judicial, and executive branches. It requires determination and a continuing effort to enforce the laws that Congress has written.

It has been said that the Attorney General's recent memorandum banning all wiretapping and nearly all eavesdropping by Federal agents, except in isolated cases, leaves as the next logical step an order instructing Federal law-enforcement officers to wear blinders and stuff cotton in their ears. On Monday, July 10, 1967, the *Christian Science Monitor* noted that:

The Attorney General's rulings mean that some federal agents have been stripped of some of their most effective weapons in the warfare against organized crime. And at the very time there exists the overwhelming need to escalate that warfare.

The battle against crime has not been won. The problems are still with us in even greater numbers. I quote herewith the *Christian Science Monitor* editorial with the hope that it will receive the careful attention of my colleagues:

RECONSIDER THE WIRETAP BAN

In issuing new regulations banning all wiretapping and practically all eavesdropping by federal agents, except in national security investigations, Attorney General Ramsey Clark has gone too far.

His purpose—to protect individual privacy in accord with the Fourth Amendment provision against unreasonable searches—is commendable. But constitutional rights are not absolute. Government errs when it interprets them so broadly that their enforcement would substantially endanger the public safety.

The individual's right to privacy, especially now that developments in technology make invasion of that right increasingly easy, deserves adequate protection. But this right must always be weighed against the public's right to safety—its right to receive adequate protection against the ruthless and well-organized forces of the national crime syndicate.

The Attorney General's rulings mean that federal agents have been stripped of some of their most effective weapons in the warfare against organized crime. And at the very time when there exists the overwhelming need to escalate that warfare.

Mounting public pressure is building for a tough crackdown on crime, regardless of individual liberty. The Attorney General's regulations could well have the unintended effect of adding to that pressure, and thereby ultimately hurt more than help the cause he espouses.

The public as a whole have "certain unalienable Rights," among which are "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." The government errs when it interprets the Fourth Amendment so liberally that it seriously impairs the ability of its own agents to protect these rights of all the people.

The Constitution was established not only to "secure the blessings of liberty" and "provide for the common defense" but to "insure domestic tranquility" and "promote the general welfare." Mr. Clark's regulations, going well beyond President Johnson's 1965 statement on the subject, fail to strike the needed balance.

He may have been anticipating that the Supreme Court will ban the use of eavesdropping devices which do not demand a physical trespass. In our judgment, he should not have so anticipated. And the court should not so decide. We also find unduly restrictive

the decision not to permit wiretapping by federal agents where information gleaned will not be publicly divulged or introduced as evidence.

Without at least these uses of electronic surveillance—coupled, to be sure, with adequate administrative controls—we seriously doubt whether the government can mount an offensive capable of protecting the public from the insidious machinations of Mafia-type operations. We hope that the Attorney General will reconsider his extreme and rigid regulations in light of the pressing national need to root organized crime from the American scene.

L. B. J. AT THE SUMMIT FORGES NEW HOPE FOR A PEACEFUL WORLD

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Johnson said the world is a little less dangerous place because they met. This could well be true, for even getting to know one another better could make future communications between the two reader and more productive.

This editorial opinion, expressed by the *Wichita Eagle*, sums up, I think, the view shared by a majority of sensible Americans. We know that the summit meeting between our President and the Soviet Premier did not produce dramatic agreement on a host of outstanding differences.

But as the *Eagle* notes, the world may indeed be a less dangerous place simply because the two most powerful leaders in the world expressed themselves candidly and openly with one another.

Perhaps—

Says the *Wichita Eagle*—

the most significant thing about the meetings is their tone—relaxed and amicable. Such a beginning can only make it easier to work toward further understanding.

In my judgment, most of the American people are rightly proud of President Johnson's proven statesmanship and continuing, tireless efforts in pursuit of a just, enduring peace. Surely the Glassboro meetings have served to bring home to Premier Kosygin these qualities and dedicated objectives of our President, as spokesman for the American people.

The President's policies toward the Soviet Union have been firm, but fair. The Glassboro summit should have brought a greater awareness of these policies to the Soviet leadership—as well as a greater awareness of the firmness and resolution of our Chief Executive.

The cause of peace was therefore well served at the summit conference in New Jersey. Our hope—indeed, all of humanity's hope—is that this meeting will be but the first step in a continuous process of acquiring both greater respect and sounder understanding between two nations with the greatest capacity to advance a peaceful world.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the *RECORD* this excellent editorial from the *Wichita Eagle*:

NO PROGRESS ON MAJOR PROBLEMS, BUT SUMMIT TALKS WERE USEFUL

It is not surprising that no particular progress was made in the summit talks between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin on the two toughest issues of the moment—Vietnam and the Middle East.

And it was evident from the statements issued after Sunday's meeting that the position of neither country has been changed on those questions. They could hardly have been. The Russian attitude cannot be changed without the concurrence of the committee that really rules the Soviet Union, and its present stand is unacceptable to the United States.

But this doesn't mean the talks were not valuable. The mere fact that they happened is important. President Johnson issued the invitation and Kosygin accepted. The ten hours they spent together cannot but have resulted in a better acquaintance and a firmer grasp by each of the problems and attitudes of the other. Mr. Johnson said the world is a little less dangerous place because they met. This could well be true for even getting to know one another better could make future communications between the two readier and more productive.

Both leaders reported basic agreement on non-dissemination of nuclear weapons, which is a major step forward in a vital area. It also has been suggested that they may have moved closer to agreement on halting the nuclear arms race by ending deployment of antiballistic missiles. This, if it comes to anything, would spare both nations a costly and essentially fruitless competition that would end in greater armament but no particular advantage for either.

And whatever common ground may have been found in the private talks, it would be impossible for either leader to alter his public stance at once because of the public opinion each must face at home. Moreover, the wounded cries from Peking about the meeting serve as a reminder that there is a third major nuclear power in the world now—a fact that greatly alters both the means and the substance of diplomacy.

Perhaps the most significant thing about the meetings is their tone—relaxed and amicable. Such a beginning can only make it easier to work toward further understanding.

NAVAL ROLE IN DEFENSE GAINS NEW RECOGNITION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy has been a source of pride and comfort to the people of this Nation since its founding. I believe it is a great credit to the Navy that it has maintained and strengthened its role in our national defense in the space age.

Hanson W. Baldwin, an expert on military affairs, presented an excellent picture of the current and potential capabilities of this space age Navy in an article entitled "Missiles Go to Sea" in the New York Times of Sunday, June 9.

I would like to have this article appear in the RECORD, and certainly commend it to my colleagues as a well-deserved tribute to the technology and capability of the U.S. Navy.

The article follows:

MISSILES GO TO SEA

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The nuclear age has gone to sea. Last week's news from the Pentagon that the Navy is studying a ship-based anti-ballistic missile system emphasizes once again—in modern context—Alfred Thayer Mahan's "influence of sea power upon history."

In mobility and in weapons, the marriage of the "Nuke" and the ship has transformed the two-dimensional navy with control of the seas as its objective to a three-dimensional navy with the added objective of attack against, and defense of, the great continental land masses of the world.

Strategically and tactically the role of the Navy has been transformed by the nuclear age; the depths of the sea, the space above the atmosphere and every part of every land mass on earth are now accessible to modern naval power.

Today, the single most important nuclear contribution of the Navy is its fleet of 41 missile-firing submarines, each equipped with 16 missiles, each capable of destroying with its megaton nuclear warhead any city on earth.

Nuclear-powered engines—which require no air—enable these submarines to remain completely submerged for indefinite periods and their mobility and invisibility give them unequalled defensive invulnerability.

PLANS FOR POSEIDON

The submarine-launched ballistic missile has, moreover, another major asset; it draws the lightning of enemy nuclear attack toward the seas rather than—as land-based missiles do—toward the populated land.

In the next few years the Polaris family of missiles will be succeeded by the fourth-generation Poseidon, a missile with greater power, capable—alternatively—of carrying a larger warhead for a longer distance or several warheads, as well as various devices known as penetration aids to help the missile break through the enemy's defenses.

This submarine missile force, which is an important part of the nation's strategic nuclear offensive capability, may become even more important in the next step of the arms race. If the Russians develop MIRV—Multiple Individually guided Reentry Vehicles—or several warheads for each missile, each capable of maneuvering along a different trajectory to its target, the threat of destruction to a fixed missile launcher ashore may become so great that the defensive answer may have to be to put more missiles at sea.

In addition to the Navy's ballistic missile bombardment force, the Navy's planes, flown from carrier decks, have a definite role in nuclear war. However, the nuclear role of naval aviation is now more "tactical" than "strategic"; the targets of naval aircraft are primarily near the periphery of the enemy's territory—submarine bases, airfields, radar and missile sites—rather than targets deep in the interior.

NUCLEAR DEPTH CHARGE

The Navy, like the other services, has developed so-called tactical, or smaller, nuclear weapons for specific purposes. A nuclear depth charge, which can be projected from plane or surface ship, is designed for use against enemy submarines. Small atomic bombs for taking out point targets—such as a strongpoint on a beach, are available. As far as is known, the Navy has no nuclear shells, but its short-range missiles—fired from surface ships or from planes—can carry nuclear warheads. Development of a naval model of the Army's 175 mm. gun is under way, and a whole "family" of new naval guns, some with rocket-assisted shells, others with devices to multiply present ranges many times, are under study. Any or all of these could utilize nuclear shells or warheads.

The Navy has also pioneered in the use of nuclear power for surface ships; the nuclear-

powered aircraft carrier Enterprise has chalked up records in combat off Vietnam. Nuclear power for surface ships provides virtually unlimited high-speed cruising range, frees the ship of dependence upon oilers, eliminates stack gases and provides so many other advantages that despite Secretary McNamara's reluctance (based on greater costs) a nuclear powered fleet for all major vessels seems certain.

The Navy's seagoing anti-ballistic missile system would work this way. A number of ships—some with powerful radar, others as launching vessels—would position themselves across the "window" or angle of approach of missiles launched against the United States from bases in Communist countries. Such a sea-based system would provide an outer line of defense; interception of enemy missiles could be made during their mid-course, rather than terminal phase.

INTRASTATE AIR CARRIERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt today of a reply to my inquiry of Chairman Charles Murphy of the Civil Aeronautics Board regarding the Board's position on the respective rolls of interstate and intrastate air carriers which I think is sufficiently significant that it should be included in the RECORD today with my inquiry and reply for the benefit of the Members and of the public.

The correspondence referred to follows:

MAY 19, 1967.

HON. CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MURPHY: There has been a recent announcement that you have granted to Northern Consolidated Airways temporary traffic rights for nonstop service between Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, in competition with the service now being performed by Alaska Airlines. It is understood that Alaska Airlines has gone into the State court to secure a restraining order against the State Transportation Commission from granting a certificate to Interior Airways of Fairbanks which had applied for rights to fly seven daily shuttle flights between Anchorage and Fairbanks.

The Anchorage Daily Times of May 11, in commenting on these two actions, states, "Sources in Washington reported the Civil Aeronautics Board was 'terribly exercised' by reports the State planned to approve intrastate service over a route which now is subsidized by the federal government. The CAB, one source said, 'took a dim view' of the state plans'."

This press story prompts me to inquire of you just what may be the position of the CAB in its promotion of aviation with regard to the respective roles which properly should be played with interstate and intrastate carriers. In such connection, I wish that you would include the actions and positions which the Civil Aeronautics Board has taken regarding the operation of intrastate service between Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1967.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and
Foreign Commerce, House of Represent-
atives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of May 19, 1967, inquiring about the Board's position regarding the respective roles which interstate and intrastate carriers should play in aviation.

The Board's policies towards intrastate carriers, and actions by State regulatory commissions, have evolved in the context of the limited coverage of the Federal Aviation Act over the economic aspects of intrastate activities. While that Act extends safety regulatory control over any operation "in", or which "directly affects" interstate commerce, the economic regulatory provisions do not explicitly apply to operations which "affect" commerce but are not "in" commerce (§ 101 (4) and (21)).

The scope of this statutory grant of jurisdiction affects the Board's actions with respect to both the intrastate aspects of the operations of interstate carriers and the operations of intrastate carriers. As to interstate carriers, a State Supreme Court has held that the State commission can regulate the air carriers' rates for local transportation between points in the State (as opposed to rates for interstate passengers moving between the same points). (*People v. Western Air Lines*, 268 P.2d 723, appeal dismissed, 348 U.S. 859.) Another State Supreme Court has ruled that its State commission could not require an interstate carrier to continue serving the intrastate portion of a route over which the Board had authorized the carrier to discontinue service. (*Frontier Airlines v. Nebraska Dept. of Aeronautics*, 175 Neb. 501, 122 N.W. 2d 476.)

As to the so-called intrastate operators, where a carrier operates only between points located within a single State, the Board's jurisdiction has been judicially upheld if the carrier participates substantially in the carriage of traffic moving interstate (*C.A.B. v. Friedman Aeronautics, Inc.*, 246 F.2d 173; *C.A.B. v. Canadian Colonial Airways*, 41 F. Supp. 1006), or if the carrier flies its aircraft over a place outside the State. (*Island Airways v. C.A.B.*, 352 F.2d 735.)

The Board has never asserted authority over purely intrastate carriers (not carrying interstate traffic), even where the intrastate carriers compete with federally certificated ones. Furthermore, the Board does not intervene before State commissions to oppose applications by local carriers for intrastate authority, although it may on occasion file an *amicus* statement. The same policies are generally followed with respect to State regulatory commission matters involving interstate carriers.

The lack of federal control over intrastate carrier operations by air did not present substantial economic problems until recent years. When the Civil Aeronautics Act was enacted in 1938, and for many years thereafter, operations by intrastate carriers were not extensive; and no State denied interstate carriers permission to operate over intrastate segments. Furthermore, there was little regulatory action by the States. By 1961, however, 18 States had begun to issue certificates of public convenience and necessity for intrastate common carriage by air. In California, at least, passenger traffic is already sufficient to enable intrastate carriers to operate large jet aircraft.

The California and Alaska situations illustrate the resulting problems. In California, the Board sought over a decade ago to enjoin the intrastate carrier, Pacific Southwest Airlines (PSA), from operating unauthorized flights which carried many passengers whose journeys began or ended outside California. (*Friedkin, supra.*) Eventually,

PSA agreed to entry of a cease-and-desist order which barred such carriage. (*Western Air Lines, Inc. v. PSA*, CAB Order E-19655.) Earlier this year the Board exempted PSA from Title IV of the Act to the extent that those statutory provisions applied to PSA's jet flights which momentarily operate beyond the three-mile limit in connection with takeoff or landing at mainland California points, but which do not otherwise involve transportation subject to the Board's jurisdiction. (*Pacific Southwest Airlines, Orders E-23958 and E-24895.*) (Copies enclosed.)

PSA now operates over several important intra-California routes in competition with Federally certificated air carriers, including Pacific Air Lines (Pacific), a subsidized carrier. The California Commission has also licensed at least one other carrier for operations between various points within the State.

In Alaska the Alaska Transportation Commission has undertaken to assert exclusive jurisdiction to authorize new nonstop service between Anchorage and Fairbanks, and initially attempted to prevent one federally certificated carrier, Northern Consolidated Airlines, from offering such service. The State commission also entertained an application by an intrastate carrier, Interior Airways, to offer the very same service in competition with the existing federally certificated carrier, Alaska Airlines. Although no final decision has been reached, a State court has enjoined the Commission from authorizing Interior to operate; and Northern Consolidated has begun service.

The Federal Government has a large stake in the sound development of intra-Alaskan service. Before Alaska became a State and enacted its aeronautics statute, the Board had exclusive jurisdiction over all air transportation within or to Alaska. From 1938 through mid-1959, the total subsidy bill for the Alaskan air carriers was \$77 million, of which \$42 million was for intra-Alaskan operations. For the two federally authorized carriers on the Anchorage-Fairbanks route, the subsidy bill for their total operations in all areas was about \$16 million during fiscal 1962-1966 and is estimated to be over \$2.6 million for fiscal 1967. If the Alaska Transportation Commission allows an intrastate carrier to divert Anchorage-Fairbanks traffic, the Federal Treasury could bear much of the resulting burden.

It does not appear that State authorizations for intrastate air carriers have had a substantially adverse effect upon the development of the federally regulated air transportation system. They have given rise to problems, e.g., the impact of PSA's operations in California upon Pacific, which is federally subsidized. But there is little doubt that PSA's operations have had a salutary effect upon air travel in California by way of improved service, lower fares, and increased volume. This may be an appropriate place for the Board to apply the policy that it should not pay subsidy to a carrier to provide airline service some other carrier will provide without subsidy—which is easier said than done.

Similarly, if the State Commission in Alaska should insist on actions impairing the earning ability of federally subsidized carriers, our Board may be driven to considering withdrawal of Federal subsidy. I very much doubt, however, if it will come to that.

In summary, it seems to us that there is a useful role which intrastate air carriers can play; that in most cases this will not impinge unduly upon the federally regulated systems; that we should undertake to minimize "conflicts" through informal contacts with State officials; that we should not interfere with intrastate operations merely for the purpose of asserting or extending Federal jurisdiction; that we should be alert to prevent intrastate air carrier operations from

impinging unduly upon the federally regulated system by taking such actions as are open to the Board under the present law; and that, if it should prove unhappily that the present law is not adequate for that purpose, we should then come to Congress for a legislative remedy.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1967.

HON. CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of July 10 replying to my inquiry of May 19 regarding the Board's position on the representative roles which interstate and intrastate carriers should play in aviation.

I am pleased to note that the Board recognizes that in the national transportation picture there is a useful role which intrastate carriers can play, and that there is a problem of the extent to which interstate carriers should be supported by the Board where intrastate carriers provide improved and adequate service, at lower fares, to the traveling public.

Sincerely yours,
HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman.

AIRLINE ACCIDENT INVESTIGATIONS

MR. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

MR. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House may be interested in the progress of investigations into a number of airplane crashes which have shocked the public during the last 3 or 4 months. For their information I include a letter from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the RECORD. As may be seen from the letter—

The investigation of civil aircraft accidents is now the responsibility of the National Transportation Safety Board.

Investigations into three aircraft accidents occurring in March 1967 are presently underway. It is to be noted that the investigations follow standard procedures, in which well-qualified experts are employed. The public is kept informed throughout the investigation by the Safety Board—the primarily responsible body. After their investigations are complete, detailed findings and the probable causes of the accidents will be released.

Our committee has been kept informed that a study of the accidents was underway.

If any legislation is indicated as a result of any reports of the Safety Board, and if such legislation is referred to our committee, we shall hope to act on it with all due speed.

The letter from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board follows:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY
BOARD,

Washington, D.C., July 7, 1967.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign
Commerce, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: In accordance with your request, the Board is more than happy to bring you up to date on the status of three commercial airline accidents which occurred in the past few months and in which your Committee has expressed a particular interest.

In addition, this letter will serve to review again with you, for your benefit and for the benefit of your Committee, the procedures the Board follows in connection with the investigation and reporting of results in aviation accidents of this type.

1. *Air collision at Urbana, Ohio, involving TWA DC-9 and a Beechcraft Baron B-55, privately owned, March 9, 1967.* Since our last progress report to you in connection with this case, the detailed field investigation has been completed; an extensive public hearing was held in Dayton, Ohio, on June 6-8, 1967; and we are presently receiving comments and suggestions from interested parties who have, under our rules, thirty days from the date of the hearing in which to submit them.

2. *Delta Airlines training flight crash at New Orleans, Louisiana, March 30, 1967.* The field investigation has been completed and a public hearing has been scheduled to begin in New Orleans on July 19, 1967. The hearing will be presided over by Member Oscar Laurel of this Board, and at that time all of the known or ascertainable facts will become a matter of public record. It is expected that the hearing will not last more than two days.

3. *Lake Central Airlines, accident near Marseilles, Ohio, March 5, 1967.* The field investigation in this case has been completed and a public hearing is scheduled to be held in Indianapolis, Indiana, commencing on August 2, 1967. In this case, too, the hearing is expected to reveal all of the known and ascertainable facts and to point the way toward corrective action if such has not already in fact been instituted.

I am sure you are quite familiar with the investigative process of the Board in aircraft accidents of the sort we have been discussing, but it might be well to restate it for the record.

The investigation of civil aircraft accidents is now the responsibility of the National Transportation Safety Board. This responsibility, with a staff of experienced air safety investigators, was recently transferred to us from the Civil Aeronautics Board under the provisions of the Department of Transportation Act, but the function had been exercised by the CAB from 1940 until the recent transfer to us.

The practice has always been to organize a team of experts in the various technical areas that might be involved in any such accident, under the leadership of trained investigators representing the National Transportation Safety Board. After as exhaustive a field investigation as the situation requires and permits, the Board schedules and holds a public hearing at or near the site of the accident. At this stage of the process, all interested parties, such as the airline concerned; the Federal Aviation Administration; airline employees associations; air-frame manufacturers; engine manufacturers; and any other possible interested parties, are active participants in adding to and thus developing a complete record of all the known or ascertainable facts.

Subsequent to such public hearing, the Board analyzes the record and other information known to it and issues a formal report as to the probable cause of the accident.

Of course, as you know, the entire chain of process is conducted entirely in the open, and as rapidly as facts are identified as uncontroversial and relevant, beginning at the accident site, they are immediately made known to the interested parties to the investigation and are at the same time released to the news media and the public. In fact, a major part of the constructive results which flow from accident investigations are the immediate putting to use for corrective purposes of all the information developed during the preliminary stages of the investigation or in the public hearing.

The Board appreciates and understands the continuing interest you and your Committee have with respect to the performance of the accident investigative functions by our Board. Please feel free to call on us at any time for information or report either as to our process generally, or as to the handling of any particular case.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL, Jr.,
Chairman.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON INTRODUCES ANTISMUT BILL

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will permit a person to effectively remove himself from the mailing list of any publisher engaged in the dissemination of morally objectionable material. Existing laws, which are directed primarily at suppressing patently obscene materials, have proven woefully inadequate to protect the public from peddlers of filth.

In recent months I have received numerous complaints from parents in my district who are appalled by the degenerate publications which they and their children have received, unsolicited. It is imperative this body act promptly to protect people not only from that very limited range of materials which falls within the legal definition of obscenity but also from the myriad publications which are not within that definition but are, nonetheless, repulsive to the vast majority of Americans.

Because the purveyors of smut almost universally develop their mailing lists by purchasing subscription lists from reputable publications, any man or boy who subscribes to even such a wholesome publication as a sports magazine is likely to receive printed garbage at some future time. It is this unwarranted invasion of the individual's privacy which my bill seeks to prevent.

The Horton bill provides that any person who receives unsolicited mail which he deems to be obscene, lewd, or indecent may return it to the Postmaster General and request that the sender be notified to cease sending such mail to the complainant. The bill specifically provides that any parent may take such action to protect the privacy of his children as well as his own privacy.

Upon receiving a complaint, the Postmaster General is required to notify the sender to halt all such mailings to the

complainant. If the publisher continues to send smut to the complaining individual, the Postmaster General is directed to schedule a hearing to determine whether or not the act has been violated. If the act has been violated, the Postmaster General may direct the Attorney General to apply to a U.S. district court for an order demanding compliance with the act. The bill provides that if the sender does not comply with this court order he is subject to the penalties for contempt of court.

This measure, which respects all of the recently announced constitutional limitations on the police power of the Government, will provide every American with a simple and totally effective method of preventing both his own privacy and that of his children from being disturbed by unsolicited and highly offensive pornography.

I know many of my colleagues share my contempt for purveyors of smut and I look forward to your strong support of this much-needed legislation.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON INTRODUCES TWO MEASURES TO AID THE RESOLUTION OF THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two much-needed measures to aid in settling the present conflict in the Middle East. The first of these measures is a sense-of-the-House resolution expressing what I believe are the guidelines within which a settlement must be achieved if it is to be enduring. The resolution provides that the sovereignty of Israel must be recognized, that the Suez Canal must remain an international waterway open to all nations, that all nations must recognize as final the boundaries that will emerge from the anticipated negotiations, that the shipment of arms to all countries of the Middle East be halted and that all Middle Eastern countries immediately devote their full attention to the longstanding problems of the Palestine refugees.

The second measure I am introducing should provide the necessary stimulus to cause the countries of the Middle East to relocate these refugees. It is clear that if we are to forge a lasting peace in this historically contentious area these refugees, who have long been one of the prime sources of friction between the Arab and Israel peoples, must be removed from the refugee camps along the 1949 frontier between Israel and the Arab nations and that adequate provision must be made for their permanent settlement elsewhere. Because the recent conflict has dramatically increased the number of refugees on both sides of the borders, it is now even more important that the refugee population be relocated.

Those of us who have been intimately familiar with the situation in the Middle East have long recognized the continu-

ing threat to peace which these refugee camps pose. Fortunately, many carefully considered and thoroughly documented newspaper articles have brought the importance of this problem to the public attention in recent days.

However, public awareness of the problem is not enough. Absent positive action by one or more of the great powers of the world, these refugee camps and the concomitant hostility they generate will persist long after the present crisis of the Middle East subsides.

My bill directs the Secretary of State to reimburse—to such extent as he deems appropriate—any Middle Eastern country for expenses it incurs in relocating Arab refugees from Palestine to within its own borders. These payments are to be made directly to the host governments subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary.

It is my fervent hope that if this bill is enacted into law, the Soviet Union, in furtherance of the spirit of cooperation which was manifest at the Glassboro summit meeting, will join with the United States in this worthwhile and nonpolitical effort to relieve world tensions.

Since 1948 many thousands of Arabs who were formerly residents of Palestine have existed in the miserable squalor of refugee camps. These camps on the Arab-Israel frontier have not only been a source of continuing irritation to both sides, but also senselessly demeaned the residents of these camps who nearly 20 years ago were victims of the Arab-Israel war. An entire generation of refugees has grown to virtual maturity knowing no other life. United Nations statistics indicate that over one-half of the population of these camps is under the age of 18.

If this body enacts into law the proposal I am making today, this Nation will not only be helping to eliminate one of the myriad sources of animosity that produced the recent crisis, but it will also be helping to terminate the senseless waste of human resources that necessarily continues as long as these refugee camps remain.

DAY CARE ACT OF 1967

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the Day Care Act of 1967 which was developed by Senator JAVRS and has already sponsored by a number of Members of both the House and the Senate.

This legislation will provide day care for children of low-income families in order to enable their parents or relatives to choose to undertake vocational training, basic education, or employment. Far more than merely providing additional day-care facilities, this measure is de-

signed to attack the problem of growing welfare rolls by encouraging parents to find vocational training or employment once they are assured that their children will be well taken care of during the day.

The increasing number of Americans receiving public assistance is staggering. In New York City alone, the monthly average of recipients rose from 531,000 in 1965 to 621,000 in 1966; nationally, some 7.5 million people are aided by the four federally sponsored welfare programs.

In dollar terms, the total cost has risen from \$4.2 billion in 1962 to \$6.1 billion in 1966 and these figures provide assistance to only one-half of those Americans whose income level is below the national poverty standard.

However, a considerable proportion of the 900,000 mothers receiving assistance under the aid-to-dependent-children program are anxious to undertake training and employment if they can place their children in adequate day-care facilities. These mothers want their children to grow up with parents who are working, participating members of the community, and who are not dependent on the monthly relief check.

There is a second important way in which this day-care program would reduce the cycle of dependency. The large number of personnel needed to staff and maintain the day-care centers can, to a great extent, be drawn from among the mothers who children make use of these facilities. Several existing manpower training programs can assist in training these women for such subprofessional positions. The Headstart program has already indicated that parents and neighborhood residents actively participating in their children's experiences add meaningfully to the entire program.

There are a number of other significant features to this legislation which I believe are worthy of special mention. Provisions are included in the program to make it self-liquidating. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—whose Department will administer the program—may require at least partial payment for the day-care services in the case of those families who, through employment or otherwise, are able to make a contribution.

Coordination at all levels of government and between all similar programs is mandated by specifying certain mechanisms of program administration.

Finally, evaluation requirements are written into the bill so that congressional oversight will be a meaningful, concurrent procedure.

The bill would authorize \$60 million for 1 year as a new part B of title V of the Economic Opportunity Act. This should provide about 50,000 new day-care slots—not nearly enough to meet the need but certainly a meaningful start with possibilities for expansion, and hope for self-confidence and self-sufficiency for many families who now know only a future of despair.

THE NEW LEFT

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Walter Trohan has written a most comprehensive article on the New Left which appeared in the Sunday, July 9, 1967, issue of the Chicago Tribune. Mr. Trohan is the chief of the Tribune's Washington bureau and has spent more than a year studying and reporting on campus movements which he finds shows a "hostility to law and order, to civilized behavior and to the concept of liberty under law." It is characterized by "anarchism, nihilism, and negativism and it flouts and derogates the institutions which give it the freedom it enjoys."

Mr. Trohan's report is "must" reading for any American who wants to have a better understanding of the New Left in America. I include the article with these remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I hope all of the Members will read it closely:

THE NEW LEFT

(By Walter Trohan)

The Student New Left is a many splintered thing. A common denominator is most difficult to find. The New Left is a mixture of theory, sociological action, and bitter protest. It is linked with the civil rights movement, the fight against poverty, and the war in Viet Nam.

It is all of these things, yet no one of them. If it is any one thing, it is the culmination of the age of protest. We see it in flag burning, draft card destruction, demonstrations, and challenges to all forms of authority. It carries the seeds of revolution in its anarchism—and therein lies its great danger to those who revere and respect democratic law and order.

The New Left is of the campus but goes beyond the campus. It involves students, faculty members, writers, intellectuals, beatniks, and hippies. Many of its adherents dress wildly to accentuate their nonconformism. They wear beat-up trousers and dresses, long hair and beards, and the rest. Sometimes it is difficult to distinguish among the sexes. Members of the New Left are in the minority, but they have influenced many of their fellows, and their activities affect almost everyone on all campuses, directly or indirectly.

Let it be understood that the New Left is not communist, although it is Communist infiltrated. Nor does it embrace all youth; the vast majority of young people have no part of it. This infiltration is coming from various directions. First, there is the Moscow wing in the Communist party and its youth organization, the W. E. B. Du Bois clubs. Second there is the Trotskyite wing of communism in the Socialist Workers party and its youth affiliate, the Young Socialist alliance. Finally, there is the arm of the pro-Chinese Communists, the Progressive Labor party. However, these Communists are neither in control of the New Left nor working in concert. They see the movement as a means of gaining access to college campuses, reaching the minds of students, and gaining an aura of respectability.

Many people are inclined to dismiss the New Left as another harmless manifestation of college foolishness, such as swallowing live gold fish or staging panty raids. There is more to the movement, however; if organizers and Communists have their way, a dagger might be forged for the destruction of the American way of life. The average American sees the New Left in terms of protest marches and demonstrations. These should

be enough to convince him that the movement has power to mobilize its members in large numbers to win attention or concessions.

One of the major aims of the New Left is to destroy the links between American industry and colleges. Industry and industrialists are a major source of college revenue. Universities are institutions from which industry can recruit the talent it needs and which serve as a valuable adjunct in research. The New Left is working to undermine this relationship. It attacks industry as part of the Pentagon complex, which is blamed for policies the New Left dislikes. The strongest attacks have been leveled against industries directly producing for the war effort.

For some, morality is "bourgeois" and "old fashioned." Some reject bananas as food but are devoted to them for hallucinatory smoking. Some smoke marijuana, and others dote on LSD or other drugs. New Leftists can and do look like the conventional boy or girl next door, and they often are the brightest students.

A key ingredient of the New Left is expressed in a word they like, "alienation," although its meaning is not always clear. However, to the New Leftist it signifies what he derides as "the establishment," the "power structure," or "the military-industrial complex."

"The young people of the 'movement,'" writes one of its spokesmen, "make no polite protest; they rage against the war because they see it as the embodiment of all they are fighting in American society. It is a product of 'the system' from which they are alienated."

The mood of the New Left is described by one of its spokesmen, the Students for a Democratic Society [S. D. S.], as one of disillusionment, pessimism, and alienation. Many see strong nihilistic or anarchistic strains in declarations that our present society is decadent and that bourgeois moral values are outmoded. In the core of the movement there seems to be a passionate desire to destroy, to hate, and to tear down. They hate free society, the concepts of law and order, and established values.

"Among the central questions that a radical ideology must attempt to answer are these," according to a New Left spokesman: "What are the fundamental changes needed to transform society, and what are the steps that radicals can take to bring these about?" These steps have included defiance of law, civil disobedience, and disparagement of the American heritage. But when the New Leftists are asked to describe their new society, they offer little other than implausible incantations and misty generalizations. They have no practical suggestions in their accent on the negative.

The Dow Chemical company, which is a major manufacturer of napalm, a fire chemical, has been a major target. Last Feb. 28, a student demonstration was sponsored at Old Dominion college, in Norfolk, Va., when company officers were conducting job interviews. The demonstration was orderly, although placards and literature attacked the company. A much larger anti-Dow demonstration was staged at the University of Wisconsin, in Madison. The student newspaper carried the headline: "S. D. S. to Block Chemical Company Interviewing" and told of a massive sit-in against the interviews. Still another demonstration was staged at Penn State university. Students walked into the room where interviews were being conducted and called for a discussion of the "moral issues of the war in Viet Nam."

The right to dissent is the key weapon of the New Left. However, its leaders would confound this right with what they believe to be a right to break any law that does not please them. Civil disobedience of the New Left has manifested itself in blocking traffic, lying down in doorways, and invasion of pri-

vate and public property. The New Left doesn't believe in attempting to repeal laws it dislikes or believes to be wrong or immoral. Instead it disobeys them and encourages others to disobey them.

Running thru the New Left movement, like a weird leit motif, is a pattern of personal habits as reflected in dress, language, and moral habits. In some respect these serve as recognition symbols for its members, not only on college campuses but elsewhere. Many New Leftists are identified by their beatnik-style long hair and sandals. Some of the young men wear beards, and the young women dress in black stockings, old shoes, and odd-fitting dresses. Often personal cleanliness is neglected, as is evidenced by dirty finger nails, unbrushed hair, and unwashed faces.

In the anti-Viet Nam war demonstration in Kezar stadium in San Francisco last April, a high percentage of the participants were beatniks and hippies, who were conspicuous with their long hair, unkempt beards, sandals, and multicolored wearing apparel. They were heckled during their parade to the stadium by pro-Viet Nam war demonstrators, who kept calling, "Take a bath!"

A curious psychology seems to underlie the desire for unconventional dress. At the heart of the New Left is the concept of rebellion against society and its institutions. Bizarre dress becomes, in the eyes of the New Leftists, a way of striking back at what they call regimentation. They want to be different. They seek ways to scoff at established institutions—not only to satisfy their own inner feelings of alienation, but to antagonize those who believe in the accepted morality. To the New Left, unconventionality is an inherent characteristic of its view of the world.

Associated with the habit of weird dress is widespread use of drugs, or the psychedelic world. It is difficult to state with accuracy the extent of hippie activity among members of the New Left—the use of LSD, marijuana, opium, dried banana skins, and other types of drugs or supposed drugs.

Obviously, many New Leftist followers have not dabbled in this activity, just as many do not adopt the strange mode of dress. However, the New Left does nothing to discourage use of or experimentation with drugs. Considerable publicity about drugs on campus has appeared in the press. Don Smith, the onetime New Left president of the Student Council at Iowa State university, admitted that he smoked marijuana at pot parties on the campus. The Scholastic, student magazine of the University of Notre Dame, has discussed use of drugs on the campus. The use of drugs seems to be part of the shock psychology of the New Left. It is a demonstration of its spirit of rebellion and practical evidence of its unconventionality. Still another hallmark of the New Left is the use of obscene language. Here again is evidence of the desire to be different and to be nonconformist. Four-letter words are frequent in "New Left Notes," the publication of the S.D.S., the New Left's campus bastion. Its writings are designed not only to shock, but also to make the authors feel themselves to be part of the "liberal modern trend," which accepts and encourages such language in literature and daily life.

Some obscene language even appears in college newspapers. The Observer, student newspaper at the University of Notre Dame, carried an article last Dec. 8, on California's anti-nudity laws. The story contained a paragraph sprinkled with obscenities. The March 14 issue of "The Spectrum," a publication of the State University of New York, in Buffalo, published a review of a performance given by "The Fugs," a university musical group. The article described, in "frank" language, the music performed and the lyrics employed. The songs ranged from a gutter description of sex to an obscene description of American foreign policy.

The moral standards of many New Leftists can be summed up in the dictum: "Whatever you want to do goes!" S. D. S. members have held some meetings in rural resort areas with members of both sexes, dressed and undressed, using the same cabins. In sex, as in language, dress, and drugs, some New Leftists believe they can assert their individuality and personality by unconventional behavior. It is ironic, however, that members of the New Left in their desperate effort to throw off the fetters of convention adopt a code even more rigid and binding than what they throw off.

A San Francisco church recently offered its facilities to hippies, and a controversy arose. The clergyman who made the offer said that hippies have "a very strong and urgent spiritual hunger" and the church should help them. An official of the church, however, took exception, saying: "When a group of people reject the moral code of our society, curse and swear, are admitted fornicators, are physically unclean, reject, if not despise, the law, etc., I believe they are un-Christian and immoral. The fact that they may practice principles which are also Christian, does not make them either Christian or religious."

Another key characteristic of the New Left is unrelenting criticism of the United States usually accompanied by approval of its enemies. The New Leftists not only shout that the United States is wrong but they also assert that this country must have an evil, malicious, and unworthy motive for almost any action it takes.

In the war in Viet Nam, the United States is accused of "murder," "destroying civilians," and "unjustified and immoral bombing." At the same time virtually nothing is said about Viet Cong or communist atrocities, raids, and terror tactics. This hatred of things American constitutes a devil theory of modern history.

An anti-Viet Nam war rally was held at the University of Hawaii on March 21, 1966. The platform of Hemenway hall was decorated with a large parody of the American flag. Dollar signs replaced the stars; the flag was red, white, and black, and the stripes were pointed. A Viet Cong flag was flown. There were two signs, one with swastikas at the top and bottom, which bore the legend, "Down with L. B. J. and his fascist running dogs."

The anti-Americanism of the New Left is demonstrated in many ways. Draft cards have been burned. The flag has been desecrated. Bitter attacks are made on American policy and on our leaders. In an anti-war demonstration in New York City, floats included a replica of the Statue of Liberty lying on its side. Trucks were filled with parts of mannequins to symbolize destruction in Viet Nam. There was a replica of a submarine painted yellow. More than 50 persons burned their draft cards in Central Park during the demonstration in a ceremony organized by the Cornell university chapter of S. D. S.

"They are a minority, a tiny minority, and not a very representative one at that," the Washington Daily News commented editorially on the New York draft card burning. "What unites them is their faulty vision. They have a truly astigmatic view of the war. They ignore United States motives in Viet Nam: to let the South Vietnamese settle their political future free from subversion from the north. They ascribe to the United States only the basest of motives: murder, conquest, dominance."

One looks in vain for any comparable criticism of North Viet Nam, of its communist allies, Soviet Russia and Red China, from the New Leftists. Not all the New Leftists, or even a majority of them, are Communists, but many Communists are New Leftists. The New Leftists seem to share the basic communist hatred of America, a hatred that apparently can be satisfied only by the total destruction of this country.

In its nihilism and anarchism lies the danger of the New Left. The National Guardian of April 8 carried this analysis of S. D. S.: "A year ago S. D. S. was discussing the possibility of moving 'from protest to politics.' Today the discussion is 'from protest to resistance.' The distinction between politics and resistance is so great as to imply a qualitative change. By politics the S. D. S. meant the creation of a leftist political force in the United States that would work within the norms of society. By resistance, according to Gregory Calvert, S. D. S. national secretary, is meant this formulation: 'No matter what America demands, it does not possess us. Whenever that demand comes—we resist.'"

The concepts of "resistance," not working within "the norms of society," should be noted. The S. D. S. plans to organize unions of draft resisters. Carl Davidson, S. D. S. national vice president, said anti-draft organization "moves from protest activity to activity that takes on more and more of the characteristics of a seditious resistance movement." Davidson added that if arrest of draft resisters is inevitable, they "should jump bail, cut out, and go underground, either in the United States or Canada."

The resistance concept was developed by Calvert, who said the S. D. S. has to "build a movement out of people's guts, out of their so far internalized rejection of American society, and present people with a revolutionary alternative to the American way of life." Calvert continued:

"A resistance movement, based on the slogan, 'not with my life, you don't,' is basic to helping people break out of their own prisons. People are capable of doing extraordinary things when they are in resistance. They can walk out on their studies and take up new lives if necessary. They do not walk to gas chambers. In the process of resistance, in struggling against the powerlessness that capitalism imposes on the individual, there is a rediscovery of self in the midst of dehumanizing society."

"Many of us in S. D. S. share a conviction that this is what has to happen. That we must resist, and that people must break free. None of us is sure we can win. All we can say is that there are other ways to lead our lives in the face of the obscenity of what American life is—and we intend to live that way."

The S. D. S. idea that American society isn't worth saving is amplified by Yale Prof. Staughton Lynd, the philosopher in residence of the New Left. He says:

"Participatory democracy seems to be driving toward the 'live-in,' the building of a brotherly way of life even in the jaws of the leviathan. It is conscientious objection not just to war, but to the whole fabric of society. It is civil disobedience not just by individuals, but, hopefully, by broad masses of alienated Americans. Like the conscientious objector, however, the participatory democrat has unfinished business with the question: Is what's intended a moral gesture only, or a determined attempt to transform the American power structure?"

The flag desecration and the draft card burning are apparently the outward manifestations of a deeper malady—a total rejection of the United States of 1967. This rejection would be brought about by various types of resistance in the hope of ripping apart the American society.

Another prime target of the New Left is the military. Not only does the New Left hate the war in Viet Nam and all military leaders, but it also hates the uniform and the flag and anything else that smacks of patriotism.

Most especially does the S. D. S. hate the selective service system. The draft and military service represent the "old system" the New Left would overthrow and the American military effort in Viet Nam. Some New Left-

ists shuttle among campuses organizing protest. Members of the New Left counsel students on how to avoid military service, and some have burned their draft cards, usually at a public rally to capture headlines. By involving themselves in civil disobedience protests New Leftists have received support from pacifists and some religious groups.

A petition supporting draft card burning, refusal to pay income taxes, and military desertion was signed last April at a national conference on the draft held in St. Louis. The signatories supported emigration to Canada by American youths so they could avoid the draft. The same month the S. D. S. participated in an anti-Viet Nam war rally in New York City. Attendance was estimated at between 100,000 to 125,000. S. D. S. president Nick Egelson urged support of the peace movement by draft card burning. He praised the 75 students who burned their cards during the rally and called upon those attending to "refuse to go to war, and join us in acts of disobedience if the war continues."

Last December the national S. D. S. council met at the University of California, Berkeley. S. D. S. Vice President Davidson, a philosophy instructor at the University of Nebraska, proposed formation of anti-draft unions. He said he thought that a small percentage of youths of draft age, perhaps 3 per cent, if properly organized, could disrupt operations at local draft boards. He explained that 20 or 30 youths could accompany each objector to his draft board, where they could protest and harass selective service officials. This S. D. S. council also discussed elimination of grades at various campuses to create problems for draft boards which rely on student grades for draft deferments.

An article in New Left Notes, official S. D. S. organ, offers instruction on harassment of draft officials. Among its suggestions are:

"Send items to your draft board to be put into your file [as they are supposed to keep these], such as a copy of Trotsky's 'History of the Russian Revolution,' or Mao's 'Military Writings.' [One person in the west expropriated several hundred Gideon Bibles, and sent one to his draft board each day for six months.]

"You are supposed to notify your board of any change in your physical condition, so you might wish to send them a postcard each day telling them you had sneezed the night before."

"Go to the board and demand to see your file. Under most circumstances, there is nothing to prevent you from absconding with all or part of your file."

"Send a weekly note to your board saying you lost your draft card and need a new one."

"Don't forget the possibilities of feigned insanity."

In recent months there have been many sit-ins at draft boards. S.D.S. members at the University of Texas sat down in an Austin draft board meeting last October. At Princeton university, a full page advertisement appeared in the student paper of last April 14, signed by 66 students, who said they would not fight in Viet Nam. A similar ad signed by 33 students appeared in the Michigan State university paper.

The New Left has demonstrated against military research conducted at universities and colleges. At the University of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, two protests were staged last October against alleged "germ warfare research."

The New Left is also bitter against other "things military" on the nation's campuses: recruiting, military parades, drills, R.O.T.C., and even military-sponsored social functions.

Early this year, students at Claremont college, in Claremont, Cal., held a silent protest against a visit by Lt. Gen. James C. Richardson, commander of the 6th army,

to review an R.O.T.C. drill. The S.D.S. chapter of the University of California, at Santa Barbara, picketed an R.O.T.C. drill. And students of the University of Notre Dame demonstrated during a review of R.O.T.C. units by the university's president.

When recruiting teams come to campuses, the New Left often organizes demonstrations. Last winter the S.D.S. conducted a demonstration at the University of Maryland to protest the presence of navy and marine corps recruiters. A sit-in was staged around an air force recruiting booth at Oberlin college, in Ohio, and students at State university, New Paltz, N.Y., tried to prevent recruiters from meeting students.

New Leftists often use campuses as mobilization centers for demonstrations against nearby military bases and industrial facilities. Last November S.D.S. units at San Fernando Valley State college, Northridge, Cal., protested the war at the California air national guard facility in Van Nuys. Some of the protesters were arrested. At the trial, evidence was developed that the participating students were given S.D.S. instructions on how to behave or misbehave, and they evidently were told in advance that bail would be provided by a professor. The judge held that the students had a right to dissent but not to break the law. Other off-campus demonstrations also have been held by college students at Fort Monmouth, N.J., and Fort Holabird, Md.

Last April scores of students at Howard university, a Negro college in Washington, chanted "burn, baby, burn" as they set fire to an effigy of Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, director of the selective service system.

A favorite tactic of the New Left on college campuses is the disparagement of America's leaders. Americans have long been critical and outspoken about their leaders, and they consider such criticism a sacred right. However, the current criticism differs from that of the past in that it arises from the intellectual community, where tolerance and understanding should be watchwords, but, too often, are not.

Violent and disrespectful remarks against the President, the Vice President, members of Congress, and ambassadors have become a way of life among members of the New Left. Not only are the leaders denounced in writings and speeches in language that is vitriolic and even shameful, but they are booed and derided when they make public appearances. Last September, when President Johnson visited Detroit, the Detroit Committee to End the War in Viet Nam demonstrated in front of Cobo hall, where he spoke. During the President's speech, the demonstrators moved into the hall and shouted anti-war slogans. They were ejected by guards.

Last October, President Johnson spoke at the East-West center of the University of Hawaii. Anti-war demonstrators unfurled a banner which read, "You are the aggressor." They also carried bamboo poles from which two life-size figures hung in effigy, one in the uniform of an American soldier which was labeled "Pentagon," and the other in cowboy clothing with the initials "L.B.J." The bad taste of some of the signs can be judged in their slogans: "L.B.J. Heading for His Last Roundup," "Our Vietnamalady is Pentagonorrhea," and "L.B.J. Murders My Asian Brothers."

Last January the "Newsletter," student paper of Johns Hopkins university, Baltimore, ran a poll for men of the year, 1966. One of the candidates was President Johnson, who was characterized as follows: "Last year's top mass murderer was a Texas plowboy who has come a long way in the American crime business. Lyndon Baines Johnson of Johnson City, Tex., graduated from his humble origins of torturing half caste Indians . . . to the American Presidency, where he killed John F. Kennedy, Lee Harvey Os-

wald, Jack Ruby, and 13 other people whose names have been withheld by request. Johnson, an easy-going ex-school teacher whose hobby is bombing defenseless people, culminated a remarkable five years, when, on Dec. 25, he told Jack Ruby to die of cancer."

The genesis of a demonstration is revealed in what happened at Antioch college, Yellow Springs, O., in connection with a Presidential visit to nearby Dayton last September. The demonstration was sponsored by the Antioch Committee to End the War in Viet Nam, and the S. D. S., the sponsors, posted this notice on a college bulletin board:

"President Johnson is coming to Dayton on Monday, Sept. 5, Labor day, to speak at the Montgomery County fair. . . . It is extremely important that Johnson's illusory consensus be dramatically and publicly challenged as often as possible. The unpopularity of the Viet Nam war—one of the least popular wars in history—has, in fact, been stimulated and maintained by such challenges. Their [sic] is a need, therefore, for as many people as possible to confront Johnson on Monday afternoon."

"Realistically, any demonstration before an American President contains possibilities of physical violence and arrest. Their [sic] will be a meeting . . . to discuss types of action to be carried out, discipline, transportation, and availability of legal assistance and bail money [in case such contingencies are necessary]. It is essential that anyone intending to take part in Monday's demonstration attend this meeting."

Note the mention of "violence," "arrest," and "bail money," which indicates the extremes to which organizers of the New Left are willing to have others go or to go themselves, if necessary.

Vice President Humphrey, one of the founding fathers of the left-wing Americans for Democratic Action, has been pilloried time after time by the New Left, which hates him as a member of the establishment and as a supporter of war policy. Last October, Humphrey was picketed at the University of Florida, in Gainesville. When he spoke at the 200th anniversary of Rutgers university, pickets representing the S. D. S. and Women Strike for Peace carried signs, which read: "Humphrey—Killer Hawk" and "Support Your Vice Assassinator." Still another placard portrayed President Johnson holding a machine gun: its legend said, "Blood Finger Johnson."

Last February a mob of students stormed Humphrey's limousine after he had participated in a student forum. Young men and women banged on the windows and body of the car with their fists, shouting, "Shame! Shame!" and "War criminal!" Secret service men had to clear a path for the car by shoving demonstrators out of the way. Neither the President nor the Vice President would abridge the right to dissent, even at the risk of personal violence. But they must feel that the right is often carried too far.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara have been prime targets of the New Left. Last March, Rusk was heckled when he spoke to an audience of 2,000 at Cornell university, and in December he was the target of demonstrations at a two-day peace vigil at Ohio university, in Athens. McNamara was jeered and heckled in an appearance at Harvard last November. Some students threw themselves beneath his car and forced him out. Last February, 500 Harvard and Radcliffe students staged an hour's demonstration, planned by S. D. S. against United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg. Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, spoke at Pembroke college in Providence, R. I., last November. After the speech a group of students charged the platform. Police ushered the general out thru a side entrance.

At San Fernando Valley State college, in Northridge, Cal., Vice President Humphrey stopped his speech and addressed an S.D.S.

group whose members were heckling him. "One of the things college is supposed to teach you is manners," he said. "A number of you appear to have flunked that course."

Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, draft administrator, has repeatedly been a target of the New Left. Recently, extremist student elements, thru boisterous and unruly acts, prevented him from delivering a talk at Howard university. He was hanged in effigy on the campus.

The New Left displays an intense hostility to government investigative agencies and police. The CIA and FBI are part of the "Establishment" and therefore dangerous to the kind of "freedom" envisioned by the New Left. At a rally, sponsored by the campus Viet Nam Day committee, at the University of California, Berkeley, last Feb. 23, speakers verbally attacked the university administration, the Berkeley police department, the CIA and the FBI.

Morris Hirsch, a faculty member, criticized the university for furnishing records to investigate agencies without student permission. He called for an end to any cooperation with the FBI and CIA. Bettina Aptheker, student communist leader and daughter of the well-known communist leader, denounced cooperation between the university and the FBI and CIA. She called upon professors and students to join in driving them off the campus.

The intellectual intolerance of the New Left has not gone uncriticized. The American Civil Liberties union, which can scarcely be regarded as reactionary, has attacked student demonstrations that infringe upon the rights of nonparticipants. The A. C. L. U. mentioned the protests against McNamara at Harvard and Hershey at Howard university.

"In the light of recent occurrences on some college campuses," the statement said, "the American Civil Liberties union considers it important that it does not approve of demonstrators who deprive others of the opportunity to speak or be heard, or physically obstruct movement, or otherwise disrupt the legitimate educational or institutional processes." The A. C. L. U. said that such actions threaten the academic freedom of others. The statement concluded that students who employ such tactics "must accept responsibility for their action."

The intolerance of the New Left is regarded by many as a prime danger on American campuses today. For in these demonstrations, many see the totalitarian patterns of Adolf Hitler or Joseph Stalin.

At the heart of the New Left movement is a bitter attack against American higher education—its policies, procedures, and goals. In fact, the very nature of the university, in its traditional approach toward education, is under assault.

The pressure of the New Left has become so organized and intense that in some schools, such as the University of California at Berkeley, rioting and demonstrations have been so common as to constitute a way of student life. In other institutions there have been sit-ins and other forms of harassment. In still others, there have been protests unrelated to the New Left but traceable indirectly to its virus of violence.

At the University of Notre Dame, students struck for the right to stay out all night, altho South Bend takes up most of its sidewalks by midnight. In Washington, students of American university staged a protest just to answer newspaper suggestions that they were apathetic because they hadn't demonstrated. And in Madison, University of Wisconsin students rioted over the direction of a bus route.

The attack against the university arises from the New Left's basic distrust of established society. The New Left opposes the university as part of the hated "power structure" which reflects the values of a "decadent society."

"In the administrative republic of America," according to New Leftist writings,

"the primary structure encountered by living beings is the bureaucracy. It takes various forms: educational [universities, colleges, and high schools], economic [corporations], military, governmental, and ideological [religious and academic institutions]."

S. D. S. Vice President Carl Davidson, in a recent issue of New Left Notes, argued that universities must be reformed. "Our educational institutions are corporations and knowledge factories," he said. "They produce conformist, pliable students for our 'dehumanized, oppressive' system." He urged students to become more militant, saying that what is obviously needed is "to build a movement on the campuses with the primary purpose of radically transforming the university community." He specifically suggests the building of a student syndicalist movement, which organization would have as a basic purpose "student power," a favorite New Left slogan.

"What we do want," he says, "is a union of students where the students themselves decide what kind of rules they want or don't want. Or whether they need rules at all." A primary aim of student control would be the abolition of the grade system, according to Davidson. This, he says, would be a weapon to disrupt the normal operations of both the university and the draft systems. Without grades, he says, "the selective service would have a hell of a time ranking us."

Other forms of "student power" advocated by Davidson include:

1. Constant harassment and disruption of meetings of the existing student government, such as "showing up *en masse* at a meeting and singing the jingle of the now defunct 'Mickey Mouse club.'"

2. Request or demand of the professor at the beginning of a semester "that you and your fellow classmates participate in shaping the structure, format, and content of that particular course."

3. Sign up for, attend, denounce and walk out of, and picket excessively large classes.

4. Organize students and "liberated profs" to work out "model counter-curricula."

5. Hold mock trials of university officials for their "crimes against humanity."

Davidson's ideas are being circulated widely on campuses these days. A recent report in the New York Times, which said Columbia University was considering whether to withhold grades from draft boards, listed Wayne State University in Detroit, Reed College in Portland, and Haverford college in Haverford, Pa., as having abandoned class standings.

Many educators feel that if the S. D. S. "student power" and "control" should ever come, institutions of higher learning would become centers of chaos and turmoil. Pres. Wilson Elkins of the University of Maryland says that if the "radical fringe" on his campus and other campuses gains the control it is seeking, the result will be "complete anarchy without any financial support."

Elkins emphasizes that dissent is vital to a university, but he stresses that the issue "is one of participation, not student control," and that there is a basic need for the university to act *in loco parentis* for discipline, guidance, and manners.

Other college presidents have spoken out against the New Left. Clifford Lord, president of Hofstra university, says: "A new and disturbing element has been injected thru the adoption by student groups of the techniques of nonviolent civil disobedience—a revolutionary tactic which is justifiable only where revolution is justified, i.e., where the democratic processes have broken down and offer no chance for dialog or reform."

James M. Nabrit Jr., president of Howard university, pledged support of free speech and academic freedom on his campus last April, but said the university will not become a "place of lawlessness and disorder."

John A. Logan, president of Hollins college, says: "No recent event in our national

life is so ominous as the fact that thousands of intelligent and dedicated students have demonstrated a contempt for legality and for the foundations of democratic order upon which our society rests."

Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia university, urged "self-imposed" restraint upon all members of the university community, saying, "The right to interfere with the rights of others is no part of academic freedom." He called upon professors to think twice before making a "ringing public declaration . . . on a controversial subject, particularly if it is far removed from his own areas of scholarly competence or expertise."

The "free" or "counter-university" is a manifestation of the New Left. Many such institutions have been set up on and off college campuses across the country to challenge existing educational processes. The "free university" is not a university in the accepted sense of the word, nor does it have an administration, a competent or organized faculty, or regular classes.

These so-called "free universities" represent a potpourri of hastily organized "classes," "bull sessions," or harangues on selected topics. Sometimes universities authorize use of a regular classroom, and sometimes the "classes" are held off-campus. The "free university" is an assembly of students and nonstudents, who want to study topics not given on the campus or to discuss topics in a way their teachers do not. The instructors range from New Leftist professors to Communist party leaders.

To the New Leftist, "free" connotes the opposite of "conforming." But this definition of "free" is similar to that employed behind the iron curtain, where newspapers are "free" to print what the totalitarians prescribe, just as schools there are "free" to teach the party line.

In a New York "free university," New Left Prof. Staughton Lynd of Yale was listed as teaching "American Radical Tradition to 1900." Another subject was "Socialist Thought and Action." There are often courses on civil rights, "participatory" democracy [a favorite New Left term], and Marxism-Leninism.

Communists are known to infiltrate these radical student classes, where they work among an odd assortment of radicals, Socialists, anarchists, nihilists, and dupes. The New Left Notes issue of Feb. 27 announced a seminar on the topic of "Marxism and Contemporary Problems" at Harvard university last March. The S. D. S. sponsored the seminar in association with the American Institute for Marxist Studies, which has been identified as a communist front headed by a Communist party leader, Herbert Aptheker.

The "free universities" are mainly schools for anti-Americanism and revolution, in the opinion of qualified observers. In some there may be serious discussion and some scholarship, but many professors believe their chief aim is ideological—the study of radicalism, the venting of hate against traditional forms of society, and the plotting of protests.

The Feb. 3 issue of New Left Notes carries an article by Charles Bauman, a student of Southern Illinois University free school, who said that as a student of the state school he "tried to figure out how to live in a culture he disliked." He said the free school gave him his answers.

New Left leaders do not want very many of their followers to go into "free universities" because that would drain people from the S.D.S. projects which seek to disrupt and harass university officials. S.D.S.'s Davidson says the "unfree" universities may "have it easier since we aren't around making trouble."

A sample of the trouble the New Left can make was demonstrated at Iowa State university, where Don Smith, a bearded student, was elected president of the student body.

Smith's program included abolition of all university regulation of student life outside the classroom, the elimination of class rank, and the end of cooperation with selective service officials unless a student so requested. Meanwhile, Smith addressed the American Lutheran pastors and their wives on "Why I Left the Church." Subsequently, he admitted he smoked marijuana in "pot parties" on the campus; impeachment petitions were circulated, and he resigned as student president.

One of the main reasons for the power and effectiveness of the New Left, despite its small numbers, is the widespread support the movement has received from clerical leaders as well as from teachers in the academic community.

The religious support, in particular, has enabled the movement to achieve a respectability and acceptance it probably would not otherwise have. The presence of clergymen of various faiths at demonstrations and rallies lends a moral appeal to the movement, which the movement itself doesn't have and which many of its members do not personally profess. The fact that professors often participate and give guidance provides an academic and intellectual aura.

One important clerical activist is the Rev. William Sloane Coffin Jr., Yale university chaplain. He has been very active as a speaker, counselor, and adviser. An article in the New Haven Register on Washington's birthday reported that Coffin had proposed that clergymen encourage American students to burn their draft cards.

"Massive civil disobedience in this instance is really a form of moral justice," he said. "On the other hand, we simply have to recognize that as men vote their fears and prejudices as much as anything else, there is no guarantee that majority rule represents the rule of conscience."

Rabbi Abraham Feinberg was a key speaker at the anti-Viet Nam war rally in San Francisco last April 15. The Rev. Martin Luther King spoke at a companion rally in New York the same day. The late Rev. A. J. Muste frequently identified himself with the New Left.

On Feb. 3 the New Left Notes carried a story that a group of Detroit clergymen, lawyers, and others had established a draft-counseling center for young men seeking to avoid military service. The headquarters of the center was given as St. Joseph's Episcopal church.

"Those of us creating this center are opposed to American intervention in Viet Nam and feel we have a responsibility to the many young men who are being forced to fight in the war they may not understand or agree with," said the Rev. David M. Gracie, center chairman. "This responsibility includes discussing with them the alternatives to military participation in this immoral war."

Use of such phrases as "immoral war" by the clergy lends a moral or spiritual tone to New Left disobedience. These clergymen apparently see in the New Left a "sense of mission," or "a moral thrust" to a better society.

Other clergymen consider it unfortunate that they do not look deep enough to see that this radical fringe actually is working against law and order, deeply distrusts democratic processes, and possesses not a constructive "idealism" but a cynical attitude toward the nature of man.

There are many varieties of opinion among New Left adherents, there doesn't appear to be much sincere belief in religion and God. Some New Leftists were reported to have joined in a mingling of the sacred and profane under the vaulted dimness of Washington cathedral last May 21. Some young women danced in mini-skirts to rock 'n' roll bands on the altar. Some of the more impious smoked cigarettes and sneered at a service. Some observers thought they detected blasphemy and desecration, but Suffragan

Bishop Paul Moore pronounced it "a terrific success."

Members of the New Left don't openly attack religion and the church, as a rule, but they give them no support. Religion seems to play a minor role in the lives of most New Leftists. Some openly admit they are atheists.

"It just bothers me to go home because I have to lie so much," said one New Left student. "I'm just sitting there and wishing I could tell them I'm an atheist, but I can't yet."

Staughton Lynd, professor at Yale university, has a tremendous influence on members of the New Left. An article in the New York Times of Dec. 28, 1965, identified Lynd as one of the New Left's elder statesmen, altho he was then only in his mid-thirties. Students were quoted as saying he could be "the one man to lead the whole left, one of those great men of history and the best political spokesman on the left."

Lynd is best known for his bizarre and publicized visit to Hanoi in late 1965 and early 1966, without state department permission. He traveled with Thomas Hayden, an S. D. S. leader, and Dr. Herbert Aptheker, Communist party functionary. On his return he addressed many New Left rallies. Lynd's influence on the New Left is immeasurable. His wife, Alice Lynd, has reported she is writing a book on draft resistance.

Greg Calvert, former history teacher at Iowa State university, was another such influence in a more limited area. Calvert left the campus to become national S. D. S. secretary.

Despite the clergy and professors among S. D. S. ranks, many other professors and students find the New Left movement hollow and superficial. They find the speakers and the writings echoing the same old clichés. They consider the protest movement entirely negative in that it offers nothing positive and is concerned only with tearing down established procedures and processes.

These professors and students, who are in the majority, do not see the members of the New Left as facing up to the facts of 20th century life. They do not see the movement as offering the intellectual integrity, hard work, and common sense needed to grapple with such problems as poverty, peace, and the nuclear age. They see the New Left's approach as emotional and simplistic.

The New Left seems to distrust all persons over the age of 30. Altho the alleged gap between the ages is as old as recorded history, the generation gap takes on a special significance among members of the New Left. It is not so much based on differences of age or environment as on distrust, rejection, and possibly hatred. The New Left has absolutely no use for the older generation and not the slightest hesitation in saying so. Julian Bond, Negro leftist legislator in Georgia, sums it up: "I'm 28 and already I feel old."

The New Leftists accuse their elders of having "sold out." They contend that any policy is invalid unless the younger generation has a hand in its formulation. They preach the right to break laws or rules they don't like.

By their self-righteous posture and contempt for those who disagree with them, the New Leftists have made themselves the most isolated group in American life. They have alienated themselves from the mainstream of university life and national life. This isolationism tends to make them more radical and more arrogant and more impractical, and it is the reason they are shifting from a policy of protest to a policy of resistance.

The greatest danger of the New Left is that it contains the seditious seeds of a new whirlwind of destruction and revolution. The impact of the relatively small membership

of the New Left is evident from the increased coverage it gets in the news media.

Student unrest and dissatisfaction, however, are not new. To some members of the older generation, student behavior is shameful, but to others of the same generation, student excesses are merely part of growing up. Mellowing college adults cannot fail to remember, usually with nostalgia and humor, some college prank, demonstration, or incident in which they participated at school that might have brought them dismissal, if they had been detected. Some were detected, and the memory is the more enjoyable.

College students have long done strange things, such as moving statues, ringing bells, dreaming up curious initiation rites, blocking traffic, defying prohibition, painting signs, putting cows in dormitories, holding panty raids, and swallowing goldfish. Today's college youths, for the most part, don't behave very differently from their fathers and grandfathers.

Student dissent does not worry many perceptive citizens today because dissent is an integral part of the American way of life—it is indeed, the very heartbeat of academic life. What concerns these people is something far more fundamental and dangerous: the alienation of the New Left from our democratic processes and ideals. It is the open hostility of the minority of students to law and order, to civilized behavior, and the concept of liberty under the law. It is the growing anarchism, the swelling nihilism, and the mounting negativism of a movement which flouts and derogates the institutions which give it the freedom it enjoys.

Buell G. Gallagher, president of City College of New York, writing in the *Saturday Evening Post* for May 6, says in discussing the new species of radical student:

"One alarming aspect of current rebellion is its disregard of the consequences of illegality. In essence this is anarchy."

The New Left identifies itself with the problems of American society: civil rights, poverty, disease, slums, and peace. But it refuses to cooperate sincerely with other groups interested in solving the problems. From their behavior the New Leftists do not seem legitimately interested in bringing about a better country, except by destroying the values it has. They are dedicated in their strange and unpredictable ways to cutting at the roots of American society.

The New Left rejects the seasoned experience of the past. Its members distrust all motives but their own. They see the future in terms of emotion and fanaticism instead of reason and common sense.

The tragedy of the New Left is that its members will not communicate. They are arrogant, haughty, and obnoxious. They sit on the side lines and criticize others, who are playing the game. They will not do their share. In addition to being fanatics, they attract a vast variety of irresponsibles and malcontents. They influence many good and true students, but they attract beatniks, kooks, hippies, and embryonic demagogues.

Recently they have undertaken to recruiting high school students. In Chicago and nearby Indiana the S. D. S. has begun attempting to organize high school chapters. They have circulated literature among high school students which reads:

"Now it's our turn. Now the United States government controls South Viet Nam. Now it is American big business men who profit from starvation-level Vietnamese wages [\$1.40 a day maximum]. Now it is L. B. J., Rusk, McNamara, and company who yell and scream about communist aggression to the free world. While they [send] 400,000 American guys to protect the freedom of the rich landlords and American business men to get richer. . . ."

The New Leftists are anti-democratic, anti-American, and anti-common sense. Its members become prey to the superior organizational ability of the old-line subversive orga-

nizations, such as the Communist party and Socialist Workers party and their satellites. The history of the New Left is one of manipulation by men bred in the traditions of Lenin and Stalin. The doors of the New Left are open for infiltration.

"Today's college rebels are a new breed," says President Gallagher. "They know it and it's time we knew it also: New dimensions of understanding are required."

This is the task and duty of all good Americans—to know more about the New Left and to follow its anarchist, nihilist, and cynical strains. It cannot be arbitrarily equated with the Old Left, for all the communist infiltration. It is too simple to identify all members of the New Left as Moscow or Peking Communists. They are a new type of subversive and their danger, if allowed to run unchecked is great.

AUTOMATION PRESERVES JOBS AS WELL AS CREATES THEM

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the early sixties, some economists feared that automation would cause massive unemployment. Since then we have learned that advancing automation and declining unemployment are not mutually exclusive. Now, Alfred L. Malabre, writing in the *Wall Street Journal* on May 22, 1967, offers evidence suggesting that cybernation may be a preserver, not a destroyer, of jobs.

First, Automation has contributed to the recent increase in jobs. It hastens the growth of new businesses and enables old ones to stay competitive. As a result, many new employees are needed—not necessarily production workers but more likely sales and research people.

This suggests the second reason automation preserves jobs during an economic slowdown. Automation has increased the proportion of white-collar jobs. These react in a less volatile manner to fluctuations in economic activity.

Third, Automation makes it easier to trim production without laying off large numbers of workers. It increases the range of production a firm can handle with a fixed number of employees. As Mr. Malabre says, "The same knobs that were so easily turned up can be turned down."

These three changes tend to preclude any sudden, sharp rise in joblessness. But this does not eliminate the need to maintain steady economic growth. A steep decline in the level of business activity could still trigger a major worsening of the unemployment situation.

Nonetheless, Mr. Malabre's article does indicate that private industry strengthens the economy by automating its plants. Cybernation creates and preserves jobs. It stabilizes employment, especially when soft spots are showing up in the economy.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the RECORD at this point:

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Will automation turn out to be a preserver of jobs if the economy runs into trouble in

coming months? There is evidence to suggest so.

At the start of the decade, some economic Cassandras were warning that automation would soon cause massive unemployment, as machines replaced men at an accelerating rate. For a while it seemed that maybe the warnings were well founded. The nation's unemployment rate continued to rise for nearly half a year after the current economic expansion began, and the rate remained above 5% for more than three years.

The sluggish labor situation, in the face of continuing business expansion, was widely attributed to automation. Employers, with their highly automated plants, were able simply to turn the proper knobs and increase production accordingly. Additional output, it seemed, no longer necessitated additional employees.

The assumption, of course, proved incorrect. Knob-turning is sufficient up to a point. Then new employees are needed—not necessarily production workers but more likely such personnel as sales and research people. The point seems to have been reached during 1965, when the nation's unemployment rate finally began to drop sharply. By the end of the year, less than 4% of the U.S. labor force was jobless and the rate has remained below that level ever since.

In the last year or so, in fact, labor shortages have been much more a matter of concern than automation or massive unemployment. Indeed, it can be argued that automation actually has contributed to the recent increase in jobs, by hastening the growth of new businesses and enabling old ones to stay competitive.

Moreover, there now are signs that automation may be helping to keep unemployment from rising substantially as business shows some softness. Just as it was possible in the early Sixties to boost production without hiring a lot of production workers, it now appears possible to trim production without having to lay off or fire a lot of workers. The same knobs that were so easily turned up can be turned down. In addition, the spread of automation in this decade clearly has brought changes in the makeup of the work force that tend to preclude any sudden, sharp rise in joblessness.

Indications that business is softening show up, among other places, in the nation's industrial production index. U.S. output in April declined to 155.9% of the 1957-59 average, after adjustment for seasonal variations. This is the lowest output level since May 1966. As recently as last December, the output index stood at 159. The latest figure also is down from the 1966 full-year average of 156.3.

At the same time, however, unemployment in mid-April amounted to only 3.7% of the labor force, seasonally adjusted. This is precisely the level that prevailed last December and a shade less than the average jobless rate of 3.8% for all of 1966.

This is very different from the situation that existed at the start of the decade. Between June and October of 1960, in the early stages of the 1960-61 recession, the industrial production index fell about three percentage points, slightly less than the recent December-April decline. However, in marked contrast to the recent situation, unemployment in the 1960 period shot up from 5.4% of the labor force to 6.1%.

It is occasionally claimed that today's employers, unlike their 1960 counterparts, are more likely to put workers on short time than lay them off, and that this, rather than any new stability from automation, explains the continuing low unemployment level. The trouble with this idea, however, is that the average workweek declined almost exactly the same small amount in the 1960 period as in the recent five months.

The average workweek in manufacturing industries amounted to 40.5 hours in April, according to the latest Government estimate. The April figure is down from an average

workweek in December of 40.9 hours. A glance at the 1960 situation shows the trend then was remarkably similar. In October 1960, the average workweek in manufacturing stood at 39.6 hours, down from an average of 39.9 hours in June of the same year.

A steep decline in business activity, of course, could trigger a major worsening of the country's unemployment situation. Such a decline could eventually lead to layoffs involving the very sorts of white-collar personnel who became necessary when the expansion finally boomed beyond the knob-turning stage.

In this connection, it is noteworthy that such occupations tend to react in a less volatile manner to changes in the level of economic activity. And a detailed look at the makeup of the nation's work force clearly shows that such relatively insensitive jobs bulk considerably larger in the economy today than at the start of the decade. Then, more of the working population was tied down on production-line work that now can be performed automatically.

A few statistics help to underscore what has been happening. Since April 1960, near the end of the 1958-60 business expansion, total civilian employment in the U.S. has climbed about 20%, but the nation's production-line work force has risen only 9%. However, manufacturers' non-production-line employment has swelled nearly 25% in the seven years. In addition, employment in service-type businesses, such as ad agencies and computer programming concerns, has soared 35%, on the average, and even larger gains have been registered by such other service-type categories as teaching.

Obviously, it is impossible to pinpoint precisely the degree to which increasing automation is responsible for such changes in the work force. There seems little doubt, however, that automation has played no small role in the changes. And there also seems little doubt that the changes tend to stabilize employment at a time, such as the present, when soft spots are showing up in the economy.

—ALFRED L. MALABRE, JR.

AN "ECONOMIC IMPACT" BUDGET

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with the inadequacies of conventional budget statements in measuring the impact of Federal expenditures and revenues on the economy. Measuring this impact is, of course, essential in formulating expenditure and tax policies.

Michael Hugo, in an article in the July 1967 edition of the Michigan Business Review, is concerned with one major limitation of the cash transactions and national income accounts budgets. He proposes a supplemental "economic impact" budget to complete the picture of Government expenditures.

Conventional budgets suffer from a major structural limitation. They record only the payment or delivery stage of the expenditure process; they do not record the placement of orders. Yet an important amount of economic activity is generated when obligations are incurred. Thus, if an order is placed during one

fiscal year, and delivery or payment is made during another, the initial impact on economic activity is hidden. As a result, the influence of Federal expenditures may be significantly greater than conventional figures indicate. In such a situation, the Federal Government may unknowingly feed inflationary pressure into the economy.

To avoid this limitation, Mr. Hugo suggests the use of an "economic impact" budget, based on obligations incurred and accrued receipts. This series would measure the orders placed by the Government and the taxes owed to the Government.

His proposal has several merits. First, the statistics are readily available. The concept is fully defined—the last five budgets have contained summary tables of obligations incurred. Second, for the executive branch, obligations represent the major points of financial control and political responsibility.

Mr. Hugo recognizes, however, that an "economic impact" budget is useful only as a supplement to conventional budget statements. Used alone, it would entail several very clear hazards. It would both overstate the initial impact of Government outlays and present an exaggerated picture of their initial impact on liquidity.

Nonetheless, when there is a significant lag between obligation and delivery or payment, the "economic impact" budget draws a more accurate picture of the impact of the Federal financial program on the economy than any other budget.

Mr. Hugo has constructed a provocative supplement to the conventional budgets. In a period when Federal fiscal policy is being used more and more frequently, more accurate measures of its impact must be found. We need more articles like Mr. Hugo's.

I include this article in the RECORD at this point:

AN "ECONOMIC IMPACT BUDGET" (By Michael Hugo)

The financial operations of the federal government have a substantial impact on the American economy, and this impact creates an urgent need, by public and private decisionmakers, for complete and meaningful information concerning the nature and extent of those operations. Unfortunately, most analysis of fiscal policy rests on a body of statistical data which is, in a vital respect, incomplete.

Nearly all evaluations of the impact on the economy of federal expenditures and

revenues have as their empirical core the two conventional budget statements: (1) the consolidated cash statement and/or (2) the federal sector of the national income and product accounts. This holds true even though it is generally recognized that these series suffer from a major structural limitation; namely, they record only the payment (consolidated cash statement) or delivery (federal sector accounts) stage of the expenditure process.

An important amount of economic activity is generated when contracts and orders are initially placed (obligations incurred), and the conventional series do not indicate this initial impact on economic activity if enough time elapses between obligation and delivery or payment so that these stages are registered in different recording periods.¹ A complete picture of government expenditure would include data on orders placed, and thus be three-dimensional, measuring (1) orders, (2) payments, and (3) deliveries.

The nature of the process of government expenditure thus argues that the conventional series present a seriously inadequate picture of federal impact,² and, *a priori*, numerous rough calculations support this argument. For example, of the obligations incurred by object class for fiscal 1965, five object classes—accounting for 41 percent of the obligations—appear likely to have involved a significant time lag between obligation and payment or delivery; that is, a time lag which could place obligations for an object class in one fiscal year, and deliveries or payments in a subsequent fiscal year.³ Some specific consequences of this asynchronization are the differences between obligations and payments which can be observed in Table I. These data indicate the relative magnitudes involved in adding an obligations dimension to the conventional payments series. The analytical significance of this dimension, of course, depends on a qualitative evaluation of the data, and professional literature is replete with vigorous—though general—assertions that the employment of obligations data would greatly enhance the validity of fiscal analysis.⁴

¹ This problem has been dealt with extensively by Murray Weidenbaum. See "The Economic Impact of the Government Spending Process," *The Business Review of the University of Houston*, Vol. 8, Spring, 1961, pp. 3-47.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 4-16.

³ See technical note No. 1, appended hereto.

⁴ Joseph Scherer, "On Measuring Fiscal Policy," *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (December, 1965), pp. 685-86; Michael E. Levy, *Fiscal Policy, Cycles and Growth* (New York: The Conference Board, 1963), pp. 119-20; Weidenbaum, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-6, and "The Timing of the Impact of Government Spending," *National Tax Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (March, 1959), pp. 79-85.

TABLE I.—Comparison of net obligations to the public¹ (obligations) and cash payments to the public (payments), fiscal years 1962-68

Fiscal years	A. In billions of dollars								
	National defense ²			Nondefense			Total		
	Obligations	Payments	Excess of obligations or payments (—)	Obligations	Payments	Excess of obligations or payments (—)	Obligations	Payments	Excess of obligations or payments (—)
1962	\$52.3	\$51.5	\$0.9	\$60.2	\$56.2	\$4.0	\$112.5	\$107.7	\$4.9
1963	51.6	53.4	—1.8	64.8	60.3	4.5	116.5	113.8	2.7
1964	52.8	54.5	—1.2	69.1	65.8	3.3	121.9	120.3	1.6
1965	52.9	50.8	2.1	75.0	71.6	3.4	127.9	122.4	5.5
1966	65.9	58.5	7.4	82.3	79.4	3.0	148.2	137.8	10.4
1967	78.3	71.3	6.9	91.8	89.5	2.2	170.0	160.9	9.1
1968	79.3	76.8	2.5	101.4	95.6	5.9	180.7	172.4	8.3

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—Comparison of net obligations to the public¹ (obligations) and cash payments to the public (payments), fiscal years 1962–68—Continued

Fiscal years	B. In terms of percentage growth from the preceding fiscal year					
	National defense ²		Nondefense		Total	
	Obligations	Payments	Obligations	Payments	Obligations	Payments
1963	-1.3	3.7	7.6	7.3	3.6	5.7
1964	2.3	2.1	6.6	9.1	4.6	5.7
1965	.01	-6.8	8.5	8.8	4.9	1.7
1966	24.6	15.2	9.7	10.9	15.9	12.6
1967	18.8	21.9	11.5	12.7	14.7	16.8
1968	1.3	7.7	10.5	6.8	6.3	7.1

¹ Net obligations of administrative budget and trust funds, minus interfund and intragovernmental transactions and contributions to Government employee retirement funds.

² "National defense" covers the same accounts as does the functional classification "National defense" in the consolidated cash statement.

MERITS OF THE OBLIGATIONS SERIES

Obligations series receive high marks on two other counts. First, obligations have blue ribbon credentials as a series of financial statistics. As a financial statistic, the concept is fully defined by statute and administrative regulation,⁵ and the data are precisely and verifiably anchored in the operating statistics of government agencies.⁶ Secondly, for the executive branch, obligations represent the major points of financial central and political responsibility.⁷ In these regards obligations have the same significance for the executive that appropriations have for the Congress.

The analytical application of obligations data remained unlikely so long as the information was presented only in the detail of the budget appendix, and this impediment prevailed until 1958. Administrative budget obligations were totaled for the first time in the budget for fiscal 1959, and a summary of administrative budget obligations by agency first appeared in the budget for fiscal 1963. The last five budgets have contained summary tables on obligations incurred for administrative budget and trust funds, and the summary tables in the last three budgets have been supplemented by a detailed analysis, issued separately by the Bureau of the Budget, which itemizes obligations by object for the government as a whole, and for each major agency, for administrative budget and trust funds.

However tardy these developments have been, they now provide a significantly enhanced capability to analyze the economic impact of federal transactions. Regrettably, this capability has yet to be exploited; both the summary obligations data available with the last five budgets and the detailed series which accompanied the last three budgets have been largely ignored in both professional and lay analyses of the economic impact of these budgets.⁸

⁵ Public Law 663, 83rd Cong., amended by P.L. 79, 86th Cong., 31 USCA 200, "Instructions Relating to Apportionments and Reports on Budget Status," Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-34, July, 1960.

⁶ In contrast to figures which make up the Federal Sector of the National Income and Product Accounts (FSNI&PA). FSNI&PA totals are derived by numerous adjustments for timing and coverage, many of which must, by nature, be tenuous. FSNI&PA figures are not published at all for individual programs.

⁷ The President may establish reserves "to provide for contingencies or to effect savings. . . ." (P.L. 759, 81st Cong.; 31 USCA 665). The effect of this authority is to provide the President with wide discretion as to when—or whether—funds authorized by Congress shall actually be obligated.

⁸ An exception was Murray Weidenbaum's "The Inflationary Impact of the Federal Budget," Washington University Working Paper 6529, February 10, 1966.

CONSTRUCTING THE ECONOMIC IMPACT BUDGET

This paper is intended to suggest, as one possibility for employment of obligations data, that a given budget's economic impact could be measured more fully and accurately if the conventional series were supplemented by an "economic impact budget" based on obligations incurred and accrued receipts. The "economic impact budget" (hereafter referred to as EIB) can be easily constructed from available budget data. It is best understood as the consolidated cash statement with (1) obligations incurred substituted for the conventional checks-paid recording of expenditures, and (2) receipts adjusted to show the accrual of business taxes. And the difference between:

Net obligations to the public and cash consolidated receipts, adjusted to accrual basis equals economic impact budget, surplus or deficit.

On the expenditure side, the aggregate for any year is derived simply by adding net obligations incurred for administrative budget and trust funds,⁹ and then deducting intragovernmental and interfund transactions which do not involve the public. These transactions represent payments between the administrative budget and trust funds, payments within these funds, and contributions to government employees retirement funds. On the receipts side, the EIB places consolidated cash statement receipts on an accrual basis by using the same adjustment factor which is applied in the budget in converting consolidated cash receipts to federal sector receipts. Only business taxes, of course, need such adjustment.

EIB AS A LEADING INDICATOR

The value of obligations incurred as a rough "leading indicator" is readily apparent. However, use of the EIB to attempt precise measurement of the aggregate and net impact of government transactions on the economy entails several very clear hazards. For transactions where delivery and payment will significantly lag behind obligation, the EIB will somewhat overstate the initial impact of government outlays on manpower and machinery. The EIB records the entire amount of a government order or contract (obligation incurred) in a single fiscal period, even though government outlays for other than current services and transfer payments will utilize productive resources during subsequent fiscal periods.

Further, the ability of the EIB to measure government's impact on liquidity depends on where and when the costs of production are financed. If most of the cost of filling a government order is financed internally or by borrowing within the private sector, then the EIB's obligation incurred would serve as an accurate and simultaneous record of this mobilization of financial resources. In contrast, the conventional budget series would not register this activity. On the other hand,

⁹ See technical note No. 2 appended hereto.

if private sector financing is undertaken gradually over the period of production, then the obligation incurred would represent an exaggerated picture of the initial impact on liquidity. Finally, if the government makes advance or progress payments, these would be registered in the consolidated cash series.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE EIB

The January 1966 budget submission was the subject of unusually intense interest concerning the effect which Vietnam funding could have on the overall composition of the budget, the effects which that budget might in turn have on the economy, and the related fiscal policy measures, if any, which the administration would undertake. Nearly all public analyses of the budget submission and of the policy statements set forth in the Economic Report¹⁰ were based on one or more of the conventional budget series. Yet it is hard to imagine a situation where obligations data were so imperative for valid analysis of fiscal policy.

Table II represents an application of the Economic Impact Budget as of January, 1966. From the data in this table, it is evident that the major implication for fiscal policy of the budget for fiscal 1967 related not to the proposals for the budget year (fiscal year 1967) but to the midyear estimates for fiscal 1966 which had been substantially revised since the fiscal 1966 budget was originally submitted. Specifically, the estimate for obligations incurred during fiscal 1966 (EIB basis) was revised from \$135.7 billion to \$153.7 billion. The 1965 to 1966 increase was originally estimated at \$3.8 billion; the midyear estimate was \$25.8 billion. The conventional series did not register these revisions, which virtually constituted a new budget for fiscal 1966. In short, in this set of circumstances, the conventional series entirely missed the main point—for fiscal analysis—of the budget submitted in January, 1966.

During the last half of fiscal 1966, the belief was widespread among private analysts that the influence of federal expenditures on the economy was significantly greater than conventional budget figures indicated. This influence stemmed from a substantial acceleration of federal orders during the last half of fiscal 1966. Final figures for obligations incurred (EIB basis) show the full extent of the 1965–66 acceleration, which fall short of the levels indicated in January, 1966. (Table II).

The midyear (January, 1967) obligations figures (EIB basis) for fiscal 1967 show trends which are strikingly similar to those apparent in the mid-year estimates for fiscal 1966. The original estimate for obligations incurred in fiscal 1967 was \$156 billion; the midyear estimate is \$170 billion. The 1966–67 increase was originally \$2.2 billion; the midyear estimate is \$21.8 billion. Fiscal 1966 shows an excess of obligations over payments of \$8.3 billion; in weighing economic impact, this figure must be considered together with the possibility of a third straight major mid-year revision in January, 1968.

The value of the EIB as a supplement to the conventional budget series is clearly highest when substantial government outlays are being made for items with a "significant lag" between obligation and delivery or payment. Recent budgets have pegged such outlay at a high level, and subsequent budgets will very likely be similarly composed. In such a situation it will not be possible to draw an adequate picture of the impact of the federal financial program on the economy unless obligations data is employed as an additional dimension to the consolidated cash statement and federal sector accounts.

¹⁰ *Economic Report of the President*, transmitted to the Congress, January, 1966, together with *The Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

TABLE II.—Original and revised budget proposals for fiscal 1966

(Billions of dollars)

	Original, as of January 1965			Revised, as of January 1966		
	1965 estimate	1966 estimate	Change	1965 actual	1966 estimate	Change
EIB basis:						
Defense ¹	\$53.8	\$52.7	-\$1.1	\$52.9	\$67.5	+\$14.5
Nondefense ¹	78.1	83.0	+\$4.9	75.0	86.3	+\$11.3
Total.....	131.9	135.7	+\$3.8	127.9	153.7	+\$25.8
Receipts.....	116.5	121.7	+\$5.2	119.9	129.3	+\$9.3
Surplus or deficit.....	-15.4	-14.0	1.4	-8.1	-24.6	16.5
CCS basis:						
Defense ¹	50.1	50.0	-.1	48.2	55.0	+\$6.9
Nondefense ¹	71.2	77.4	+\$6.1	74.2	80.0	+\$5.8
Total.....	121.4	127.4	+\$6.0	122.4	135.0	+\$12.7
Receipts.....	117.4	123.5	+\$6.1	119.7	128.2	+\$8.5
Surplus or deficit.....	-4.0	-3.9	1.0	-2.7	-6.9	4.2

¹ For the EIB, "defense" covers the same accounts as does the functional classification "national defense" in the consolidated cash statement.

TABLE III

(Billions of dollars)

	1965 actual	1966 actual	Change
Obligations incurred (EIB):			
Defense.....	\$52.9	\$65.7	+\$12.9
Nondefense.....	75.0	82.3	+\$7.3
Total.....	127.9	148.2	+\$20.3
Receipts.....	119.9	133.3	+\$13.4
Surplus or deficit.....	-8.1	-14.9	6.8

TABLE IV.—Detail and derivation, economic impact budget

(In millions)

	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Net obligations of administrative budget and trust funds.....	\$117,472	\$121,754	\$127,303	\$133,724	\$154,045	\$177,666	\$188,587
Deduct interfund and intragovernmental transactions.....	-4,102	-4,381	-4,399	-4,765	-4,764	-6,524	-6,732
Deduct deductions from employees' salaries for retirement.....	-848	-917	-976	-1,046	-1,092	-1,135	-1,135
Net obligations to the public.....	112,522	116,456	121,928	127,913	148,189	170,007	180,720
Receipts, consolidated cash statement.....	101,887	109,739	115,530	119,699	134,480	154,662	168,106
Adjust business taxes to accrual basis.....	+2,500	+600	-700	+200	-1,200	-3,900	+400
Adjusted receipts, consolidated cash statement.....	104,387	110,339	114,830	119,899	133,280	150,762	168,506
Surplus or deficit, economic impact budget.....	-8,135	-6,117	-7,098	-8,070	-14,904	-19,245	-12,214

TECHNICAL NOTE NO. 1

The author constructed these speculative estimates from object class descriptions set forth in Budget Bureau circular A-12, "Uniform Classification According to Objects," April, 1961. Obligations incurred for fiscal 1965 were classified as follows:

Significant lags (41%)

- (7.9%) Equipment
- (2.6%) Lands and structures
- (11.4%) Grants, subsidies, contributions
- (12.7%) Supplies and materials
- (6.6%) Research and development *

* The official object classes do not separately identify obligations for research and development contracts, but a close estimate can be derived from (1) data on obligations for all R & D contained in Tables 1 and 2 of "Special Analysis I" of the Fiscal 1967 Budget, and (2) comparisons of intramural and extramural R & D contained in Volume 14 of *Federal Funds for Research, Development, and Other Scientific Activities*, (National Science Foundation, July, 1956), Table C-54.

Insignificant lags (58%)

- (19.0%) Personal services and benefits
- (2.5%) Travel and transportation of persons and things
- (1.1%) Rent, communications, utilities
- (2.2%) Printing and reproduction
- (6.2%) Other services, except for R & D
- (6.8%) Investments and loans
- (15.3%) Insurance claims and indemnities
- (7.1%) Interest and dividends
- (2.2%) Refunds

Unfortunately, the "object classes" used by the Bureau of the Budget are, from the point of view of economic analysis, deplorably heterogeneous. For example, object class 26 totals, without distinction, obligations for office supplies, chemicals and fuels, ammunition and explosives, and materials and parts for construction and repair of equipment and structures. Object class 31 lumps together obligations for furnishings, books, machinery, transportation equipment, and armament. Object class 32 does not distinguish between obligations for land, interest in land, acquisition of structures, construction of structures,

and fixed equipment. Object class 41 combines grants and subsidies to State and local governments, individuals, and extranational recipients.

If it were possible to establish probable time lags for certain object classes or subclasses, it would still be necessary to relate time and behavior. A six month lag between obligation and payment or delivery for a particular object class is significant only in relation to the length of the fiscal period, and to points in time within single or successive periods. A six month lag would be highly significant on a quarterly basis, but its significance within twelve months would depend on the point of obligation within that twelve months.

TECHNICAL NOTE NO. 2

In order to maintain symmetry with the consolidated cash statement, the EIB shows obligations to the public *net of receipts*. However, gross obligations to the public provide a more realistic measure of the government's aggregate impact on the economy. While the surplus or deficit remains the same, the difference between net and gross obligations to the public is substantial.

(In billions)

	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Gross obligations.....	\$204.9	\$235.0	\$246.9
Deduct interfund and intragovernmental payments.....	4.8	6.5	6.7
Deduct reimbursements between accounts.....	28.1	32.5	30.0
Gross obligations to the public.....	172.0	196.0	210.3
Deduct recoveries of prior year obligations.....	1.5	1.2	1.1
Deduct receipts from the public.....	19.8	22.2	25.9
Net obligations to the public ¹	150.7	172.6	183.3

¹ In order to make this total correspond precisely to net obligations to the public, EIB basis, it would be necessary to deduct payments to employees retirement funds, as is done in table IV.

The receipts from the public which are applied directly to finance program operations serve to substantially reduce the apparent magnitude of government financial operations. The \$25.9 billion of such fiscal 1968 receipts were collected by five types of accounts:

(In millions)

Public enterprise (revolving) fund accounts.....	\$21,330
Trust enterprise (revolving) fund accounts.....	1,939
Intragovernmental revolving and management fund accounts.....	1,851
General fund accounts.....	559
Trust fund accounts.....	193

Some of the major programs involved are:

(In millions of dollars)

Program	Fiscal 1968	
	Gross obligations	Net obligations
Department of Agriculture:		
Commodity Credit Corporation:		
Price support and related programs.....	8,221	2,615
Farmers Home Administration:		
Agricultural credit insurance fund.....	752	-12
Rural housing insurance fund.....	469	-15
Direct loan account.....	529	-487
Rural housing direct loan account.....	60	-1,621
Post Office Department: Postal fund.....	6,804	651
Department of Housing and Urban Development:		
Renewal and housing assistance:		
Urban renewal fund.....	447	79
College housing loans.....	362	-1,298
Low rent public housing fund.....	948	368

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Fiscal 1968	
	Gross obligations	Net obligations
Department of Housing—Continued Federal National Mortgage Association:		
Management and liquidating functions	244	-302
Special assistance functions	505	121
Participation sales fund	350	
Loans, secondary market operations	1,400	
Federal Housing Administration:		
Federal Housing Administration fund	1,000	16
Veterans' Administration: Direct loan fund	203	-94
Export-Import Bank: Export-Import Bank fund	2,852	753
Small Business Administration: Business loan and investment fund	605	5
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority fund	506	113

PRICE-WAGE GUIDEPOSTS REVISITED

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the concept of wage-price guideposts fixed by the Federal Government to help ward off inflation requires better understanding by public as well as by Members of Congress and the administration.

A recent article in the American Bar Association Journal by Dr. Reuben E. Slesinger, professor of economics at the University of Pittsburgh, contributes to our understanding of the guideposts by reviewing their history and application.

The professor made three particularly noteworthy observations.

First, serious questions of public policy are raised by the use and misuse of stockpiles by the administration. Dr. Slesinger points out:

Presumably, the stockpile was accumulated for reasons of national security, and additions or subtractions should be geared to this consideration. Nevertheless, threats of stockpile disposal were used to attain far-removed objectives, even at the expense of national security. . . .

Second, the professor feels that the administration has been "less adamant" on holding labor to the wage segment of the guideposts.

Third, Dr. Slesinger observes that on the balance, if the basic framework of our free enterprise system is to be preserved, the idea of the guideposts as a substitute for the marketplace must be condemned.

The author concludes:

If inflation is a danger, then it should be attacked at its source—the demand and cost factors involved.

Under unanimous consent, I include the address referred to in the RECORD at this point:

THE PRICE-WAGE GUIDEPOST REVISITED
(By Reuben E. Slesinger)

This article intends to provide perspectives on an extremely controversial current

topic, one that has brought both labor and business into conflict with the Federal Government. Although first emphasized by President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) in 1962 and outlined in the *Economic Report* of that year, the voluntary guidepost tool was brought into greater prominence by President Johnson as part of his "let us reason together" (informal) approach. The extensive emphasis on wage-price guideposts has been spurred, to a great extent, by the Administration's concern over inflation, not only because of the effects of inflation on the domestic economy, but also because of its repercussions on the balance of payments problems, which continue to influence domestic policies.

It has become commonplace to credit the idea of the guideposts, as detailed in the 1962 *Economic Report*, to President Kennedy and Professor Walter Heller (the then Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers). Although the root of the idea can be traced to an earlier period, the Kennedy-Heller approach was the first to spell out in some detail the importance of the wage-price-productivity relationship in warding off inflation. Guidelines for price-wage stability, with a recommendation for their implementation, were set forth by the Committee for Economic Development (CED) in its 1958 publication, *Defense Against Inflation*.

In his 1957 State of the Union message, President Eisenhower warned against inflation and exhorted management and labor to avoid a wage-price spiral. He urged that business should avoid "unnecessary price increases", and "wages and other benefits negotiated by labor and management must be reasonably related to improvements in productivity. . . . Except where necessary to correct obvious injustices, wage increases that outrun productivity . . . are an inflationary factor."

To implement his concern with prices and wages, President Eisenhower created two committees, one on Price Stability for Economic Growth and the other on Government Activities Affecting Prices and Costs. He also instructed the Bureau of the Budget to "accelerate programs for enlargement and improvement of public information on prices, wages and related costs, and productivity".

In his 1960 *Economic Report*, President Eisenhower made some further comments regarding the wage-price productivity relationship and emphasized the importance of influencing public opinion.

In his *Economic Report* of 1962, President Kennedy called on business and labor leaders to accept the "productivity benchmark" as a "guide" to wage and price decisions in order to hold the line on the price level. In its report the CEA used the phrase "guideposts for non-inflationary wage and price behavior".

At this juncture, the concept of the guideposts recognized several difficulties of implementation including: (1) problems involved in the actual measurement of productivity changes; (2) problems concerning the distribution of the gains of productivity between the factors of production; and (3) the irregular pattern of wages among industries. It is emphasized, too, that productivity is not the only basis for the determination of wages.

It is clear from President Kennedy's 1962 *Economic Report* that the guideposts were to be completely voluntary. There may be some apparent conflict here. On the one hand, volition and free collective bargaining without compulsion are set forth as an objective. But there was a recognition of national interests. This qualification could open the door for a degree of mandatory control and governmental intervention. It also creates the necessity for somebody, possibly the President, to determine when national interest is satisfied and if and when there is any conflict between private and national interests.

President Kennedy's confrontation with the United States Steel Corporation in April 1962, focused new attention on the guideposts. For those who sided with the steel industry, the guideposts became anathema, whereas among the late President's supporters they took on a luster.

In the 1964 report, the designation was changed to price-wage guideposts, from the earlier reference to "wage and price" guideposts, thus implying that the price guideposts perhaps had become more important than the wage guideposts. A numerical figure of 3.2 per cent was cited as being the annual average trend increase of productivity in the private economy during the last five years. Earlier the CEA had resisted citing a specific figure because of the complexity of calculating a representative average.

THE RECORD OF PRICE INCREASES

Between 1962 and 1964 the attitude of the CEA toward the use of guideposts hardened noticeably. In the words of Arthur F. Burns, former CEA Chairman under President Eisenhower: "The official position, as now developed or clarified, is that the national interest can be best served by setting wages and prices in accordance with the formula of the general guidelines—not to be sure, in every instance, but almost that."¹

Governmental and public interest in the use of the guideposts began to increase during the latter half of 1964, largely as the result of the rapid pace of domestic economic development and the attention of the Administration to major wage and price decisions as the over-all economy continued to expand. In August, in the midst of rumors that steel prices would soon be raised, President Johnson stated that he was flatly opposed to any increase in steel prices. In September, both Chrysler Corporation and Ford Motor Company signed new three-year labor agreements which were reported to amount to an annual increase of about 4.7 per cent, well above the wage guidepost; in October, after a four-week strike, General Motors Corporation also settled with the United Automobile Workers. The White House remained silent on the automobile settlements, however.

In the meantime, officers of the United Steel Workers labeled the wage guidelines as "unworkable and inequitable" and announced that the union would seek a substantial pay increase next year from the basic steel industry. In early October, Inland Steel Company, which had yielded to President Kennedy's pressure in 1962 and had refused to follow the price increase initiated by United States Steel, announced that steel boosts were now needed. Soon thereafter, articles in the trade papers as well as the general press appeared with increasing frequency, announcing that steel prices were firming noticeably and reporting that major producers were virtually unanimous in their opinions that prices "ought to go up". In late October a news story reported that the Administration believed that any increase in steel prices at this time would be extremely difficult to justify in view of the industry's nine-month profit record and the import problem. In December, 1964, Inland Steel raised the base price of galvanized steel sheet and coil by \$6.00 per ton, "less than 3%", and rumors of other possible product increases appeared in the press. Although the President had not openly opposed any steel price increase since his August statement, he called on the CEA early in 1965 to "study" the current movement to higher steel prices and to make a report.

The President's 1965 *Economic Report* contained nothing new regarding the guideposts. However, with the economy pushing upward and with the appearance of some inflationary tendencies, the guideposts grew in significance.

¹ Burns, *Wages and Prices by Formula?*, HARV. BUS. REV., March-April, 1964, page 58

cance. In March, 1965, after a three-week strike, the can companies signed a wage agreement with the United Steel Workers at a higher-than-guideline figure and immediately raised prices. Late in April, the eleven major steel companies and the U.S.W. agreed to extend their contract expiration date from May 1 to September 1. Shortly thereafter, the CEA released its long-awaited report to the President on steel prices in which it concluded that, since steel productivity had kept pace with the national trend, the industry could afford to give workers an increase in wages and benefits without raising prices. Late in May, in the strongest anti-inflation statement yet from any White House spokesman, CEA Chairman Gardner Ackley told American businessmen they must stop raising prices.

Early in June, 1965, the aluminum industry signed new three-year contracts with major unions at a figure which substantially exceeded the wage guidelines. The U.S.W. announced the value of the new contracts as being 50.1 cents per hour, an annual increase of 4.1 per cent. At the same time, aluminum producers announced partial price restorations, up to one cent per pound, on virtually all fabricated products. Newspaper articles reported that the Administration was unhappy with the industry's pricing moves. In August and September, attention again shifted to the steel industry.

Late in August, as the steel negotiations became snarled, President Johnson summoned both parties to the White House and obtained an eight-day strike deadline extension. The President then interjected himself into the negotiations, and on September 6 the steel companies and the U.S.W. agreed on a new contract. According to the union, the settlement was worth 47.3 cents per hour, equal to an annual increase of 3.7 per cent over the thirty-five month contract period.

During the last few months of 1965, a number of price increases were announced by large firms. Aluminum companies announced price restorations of 7 to 12 per cent on selected electrical conductor products. United States Steel announced a tin-free steel for cans which was cheaper than black plate and at the same time raised prices of electrolytic tin-coated products by 2 to 3 per cent. American Can Company increased prices 4 to 6 per cent on cartons for the frozen food and dairy industries; Revere Copper and Brass, Inc., raised prices for copper plate and sheet used for roofing; Bridgeport Brass Company (since merged into National Distillers and Chemical Corporation) raised prices on a number of copper and brass mill products.

It was becoming increasingly apparent that market conditions in the economy not only would support more and more price advances, but that the continued squeeze on profits was forcing companies to seek price increases as the only way to react to the ensuing cost push effects.

INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL STOCKPILE

In this setting a special development took place that was to emphasize the Administration's growing concern over rising prices and to furnish it with the opportunity it may have wanted to provide a visible demonstration to businessmen that the Federal Government intended to enforce the guidelines, at least on the price side. On October 29, Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corporation announced that it would increase the price of aluminum ingot by one half cent per pound, effective November 5, and Reynolds Metals Company, Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Company and Harvey Aluminum followed suit. President Johnson was reported to be quite disturbed over the increases. One week after Olin's original announcement, Aluminum Company of America stated it would follow the ingot price increase as well as raise some fabricated product prices one cent per pound. In retaliation,

a few days later the Government terminated the industry's efforts to resolve disposition of the national aluminum stockpile, despite an industry offer to purchase all the surplus metal. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara also announced intentions to dump large quantities of surplus aluminum in the open market. After several days of Administration criticism and pleading Alcoa rescinded its price restorations. In doing so, Alcoa emphasized that it felt strongly that its pricing actions were noninflationary and were justified by market circumstances.

The company pointed out that its return on invested capital was inadequate and that aluminum prices, even with the proposed increases, were considerably below those of several years ago. However, the company stated that it felt compelled to cancel the price restorations because of the insistence of the Government, which was urgently concerned about the possible adverse effect of any general price increases on the national economy while the Vietnam military operations were being waged. Secretary McNamara announced that President Johnson considered Alcoa's price rollback "an act of industrial statesmanship—as do I", and agreed to immediate resumption of negotiations with the industry for the "orderly disposal" of 1.4 million tons of surplus aluminum in the stockpile. Within two weeks the aluminum industry and the Government had reached agreement on the disposition of surplus metal from the stockpile.

Shortly after Alcoa rescinded its price restorations, Secretary McNamara again used material in the national stockpile to influence market conditions—namely, in copper. Early in November, all United States copper producers except Kennecott Copper Corporation had raised the domestic price of refined copper from 36 to 38 cents per pound. Mr. McNamara announced that the Government would sell at least 200,000 tons of copper from the national stockpile to ease the severe copper shortage and relieve upward pressure on prices. Within a week all copper producers rescinded their earlier two-cent advance. Next, the Administration moved to clamp down on prices for wheat and flour by announcing that it was selling high-quality bread wheat from government stocks. As a result, flour mills reduced spring-wheat bakery flour by 10 cents per hundred pounds, cash prices for high-quality wheat slumped as much as 7 cents per bushel, and wheat futures fell 4 cents.

The foregoing examples raise a serious question of public policy. Presumably, the stockpile was accumulated for reasons of national security, and additions or subtractions should be geared to this consideration. Nevertheless threats of stockpile disposal were used to attain far-removed objectives, even at the expense of national security in view of the expanded Vietnam demands. To say the least, one might raise the question of the constitutionality of these actions.

At the end of 1965 the steel industry again rolled the Administration. On New Year's Eve, Bethlehem Steel Corporation announced a \$5.00 per ton increase in prices of structural steel. Inland followed soon after, but Colorado Fuel & Iron Corporation (now known as C F and I Steel Corporation) raised prices only \$3.00 per ton. The Administration showed its displeasure by ordering defense and other government purchases of structural steel transferred to companies holding the price line. On January 5, United States Steel announced a price increase in structural steel of \$2.75 per ton (about 2 per cent) and at the same time disclosed a reduction of \$9.00 per ton (about 6 per cent) in prices of cold rolled sheet produced on the West Coast. CEA Chairman Ackley stated that these price adjustments were acceptable to the Administration. Newspaper articles implied that Mr. Ackley had "cleared" these adjustments beforehand.

It is of interest to note the Administration's less adamant stand on holding to the wage segment of the guidelines.

One of the most flagrant violations of the wage guidelines occurred in January when the New York transit strike of 36,000 workers ended in an expensive pact costing \$60 to \$70 million, or an increase of 15 per cent over a two-year period. President Johnson was highly displeased, terming the settlement inflationary and against the national interest. Under questioning from newsmen, however, the President said he planned no action, because: "We have no controls. These are voluntary matters."

In the latter part of January, 1966, the Administration expressed unhappiness with wage settlements in the construction trades. Nonetheless, most of these trade unions rejected the Administration's plea "to hold the line". The guidelines were attacked further by AFL-CIO President George Meany.

During the protracted strike against the airlines by the Machinists Union in the summer of 1966, many sides—management, labor and the Government—began to question the guidelines. The ultimate settlement did exceed the guidelines, but the concept still lives. As late as September, 1966, the Administration asked United States Representative Henry S. Reuss to postpone for a short while hearings scheduled on this issue. The President's Labor-Management Advisory Committee also endorsed a more flexible use of guidelines. Interestingly enough, labor, which had been opposing the guidelines, took a position in their favor—perhaps with the thought of being able to exert a role in flexible wage-price guideline policy. It appears also that this Advisory Committee may become the influential guideline agency, rather than the CEA, which has been more or less policing guideline policy since 1962.

That the 3.2 guideline seems to be dying slowly is evident from the number of wage settlements negotiated since mid-1966 that seem to imply a new limit of about 5 per cent. In addition, a number of price increases, although receiving varying degrees of official condemnation, have remained, such as a recent one involving stainless steel.

The 1966 *Economic Report* contained a detailed discussion of productivity and labor trends and costs and prices in selected problem areas. It emphasized the increasing importance of the guidelines by citing specific instances (steel and aluminum) where they have been helpful. However, the discussion differed from the 1965 *Economic Report* in one important aspect—the Government changed the ground rules with respect to the productivity measurement. In announcing the wage guidelines for 1966 at 3.2 per cent, the CEA abandoned its mathematical technique of using as its benchmark the average rise in output per man-hour over the past five years. In the two prior years, the five-year period had included both the extraordinarily low productivity gains of a year of recession (1960) and the extraordinarily high productivity gains of a year of recovery (1962). However, in setting the guide for 1966, using the five-year average would have meant dropping the 1960 recession year from the average and retaining the unsustainable productivity gains of a year of recovery plus four years of expanding utilization of resources. Hence, the CEA decided to drop the five-year average because it "no longer gives a reasonable approximation of the true productivity trend". If the CEA had not altered its measurement technique, the wage guideline for 1966 would have been about 3.6 per cent. However, the CEA asserted that wages should increase no faster than the sustainable trend of productivity, which is only slightly over 3 per cent in the long run, independent of cyclical swings. This shift in the method of measurement has been subjected to severe attack by organized labor.

THE CURRENT SITUATION

That inflationary pressures have become stronger in recent months is shown in the quickening rise of most broad measures of prices and costs. While farm prices, food products and nonferrous metals have accounted for major portions of the increases over the past year, price rises now appear to be gaining momentum in the industrial sector as well. On the basis of what the various price measures have shown since early 1965, some inflation has already occurred, and the major questions now are how much more inflation will there be and what will be done to contain it. The important point relative to the guideposts is that the type of inflation at present underway essentially is one of demand-pull. With the economy operating close to, if not actually at, full capacity, aggregate demand is expanding at a more rapid pace with the result of price inflation. The current federal budget is definitely expansionary, regardless of the talk of restraint. The combined demands of the Great Society and the war in Vietnam are excessively large.

In addition to an expansionary fiscal policy, the money supply (demand deposits and currency) has been rising at an advanced rate since last summer. From 1960 to mid-1965 the money supply rose at a 2.8 per cent annual rate. From June, 1965, through April 27, 1966, it grew at an annual rate of 6.7 per cent. Since mid-February, 1966, it has expanded at a more rapid annual rate.

Added to a stimulative fiscal situation and the monetary expansion have been burgeoning plant and equipment expenditures. Capital spending by business rose a rapid 14.5 per cent in 1964, 15.7 per cent in 1965, and probably it will show a 1966 rate of about 16 per cent. On the supply side, however, output can scarcely expand at the rate prevailing since mid-1964, because the labor force is not expected to accelerate, and the pool of unemployed workers has been greatly reduced. Shortages of skilled labor and of some materials are hindering growth of production, and high rates of capacity utilization already prevail in many industries.

Recently, CEA Chairman Ackley indicated that the guideposts were needed because "we can have inflation without excess demand, arising from excessive private income claims". But he conceded that the guideposts had made only a "modest contribution to price stability" and also that they could "play no significant role in a condition of general excess demand".

A POSTSCRIPT ON RECENT GUIDEPOSTS

In his January, 1967, *Economic Report*, President Johnson startled the diehards of wage-price guideposts by omitting reference to a fixed numerical guidepost percentage. Thus, the President recognized what had been happening the prior year—that the 3.2 per cent ceiling was being broken on a number of occasions, and that labor unions would not acquiesce in a 3.2 limit in the many contracts due in 1967. Thus, a decided break in the Administration's anti-inflationary attitude became evident.

The Council of Economic Advisers justified departure from the fixed guideposts on the grounds that labor unions would not accept settlements at a 3.2 per cent level for two reasons: (1) the fact that the Consumer Price Index had advanced by 3.3 per cent in 1966, and (2) the rise in corporate profits in aggregate as compared with labor income. The latter would be true, however, if profits were measured only from slack or recessionary years, such as the late 1950's or early 1960's.

The dropping of specific guideposts was not without comment by some Congressmen who suggested that hearings be conducted on this subject.

It is interesting that attention to the guideposts now is coming from some circles that looked upon this ceiling as

a stabilization and anti-inflationary measure, and now are fearful that wage increases in 1967 will be greater at a time when productivity is slackening and profits are being squeezed.

Now, let us review the major arguments that have been presented on both sides of the guidepost question. In many instances there is no right or wrong or black or white, but a cloudy gray area in which the pros and cons tend to move closer together.

THE PRO SIDE

1. During the latter half of the 1950's the American economy experienced two recessions, yet suffered from creeping inflation which at least in part was due to cost-push elements. The guideposts are intended to restrain the inflationary behavior of business and labor, both of which have discretionary market power.

2. The wage guidepost has helped the Administration to curb demands of government employees.

3. Guideposts may be effective in the short run to stall premature inflation, which reflects special bargaining positions in labor and product markets.

4. Guideposts have the great merit of calling attention to the fact that the basic way to raise the real earnings of labor is to increase output per man-hour of work.

5. The enforcement of the guideposts has not involved the establishment of a permanent bureaucracy which would inevitably widen and deepen its controls as time went on if direct controls were used.

6. From the viewpoint of the Administration, the guideposts offer the distinct advantage that they can be applied with great rapidity.

THE CON SIDE

1. Guideposts are ineffective as anti-inflationary measures. It is impossible to do more than suppress inflationary pressures in certain areas of the economy, but they still show up in other areas or in ways other than price increases, such as quality deterioration or dimensional change.

2. Underlying the guideposts is a sort of crude post-markup theory of prices which largely ignores demand factors.

3. Rather than improve co-operation and understanding between business and Government confrontations over guidepost "violations" tend to identify an industry or one company as for or against the President and the United States Government.

4. When economic freedom is not exercised, it is no longer a part of life. An economy in which wages and prices are set voluntarily according to a formula suggested by the Government would be almost indistinguishable from an economy in which wages and prices are directly fixed by government authority.

5. What's sorely missing from the guidepost approach is full appreciation of the role flexible wages and prices play in a competitive, free-market economy.

6. The guideposts will change the American system of checks and balances. Protection against arbitrary government action has been guaranteed in the United States.

7. The guideposts are based on elusive estimates of complex aggregates and are applied by an averaging technique.

8. There is a lack of precision as to when and to whom the controls or guidelines will be applied which creates inequities that can lead to an erosion of good economic relations among Government, industry and labor.

9. Guideposts, if effectively implemented, are only a step away from the direct controls which are used in centralized economies but have been tolerated by the people of the United States only in war.

10. Compliance with voluntary controls imposes a severe conflict of responsibilities on businessmen and labor leaders. The corpo-

rate official is an agent of his stockholders; the labor leader, of the members of his union. They have a responsibility to promote their interests.

On the balance, if the fundamental framework of the American enterprise system is to be preserved, the idea of guideposts as a substitute for the market place must be condemned. If inflation is a danger, then it should be attacked at its source—the demand and cost factors involved. Finally, the administrative problems met in trying to enforce a single guidepost figure of 3.2 per cent against all types of firms in all sorts of industries is far from practicable, not only because of the variations among firms and industries, but also because of the difficulties in calculating productivity changes with a high degree of accuracy.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF CONGRESSMAN MARK ANDREWS

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is my custom from time to time to report to the people of my district on my activities as their Representative in Congress, and to express my views on a number of the matters facing Congress. In the report I am sending today, I discuss the cost of police protection, the Mideast situation, and the need for antiriot legislation, plus several other topics. Under unanimous consent, I place it in the Record at this point:

Having been appointed to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Conference by the Speaker of the House every year since I was elected to Congress, I was the senior Republican delegate from the House of Representatives at this year's 4 day Conference in Canada's Capital City. Joining us, of course, were delegates from the U.S. Senate as well as Canada's Parliament and we discussed many issues, including mutual defense, the war in Vietnam, wheat sales abroad and import duties on goods shipped between our countries. The informal discussions we held provide the basis for future agreements between our 2 great nations. Pictured with me above are Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana and the Honorable Alvin Hamilton, Member of the Canadian Parliament and former Minister of Agriculture.

NO QUANTITY DISCOUNT ON POLICE PROTECTION

Generally, economies can be affected by doing business on a large scale. You might think, therefore, that a city the size of Chicago would have a lower police cost per resident than a smaller town. This simply isn't true. Police protection in cities of one million or more population costs each citizen an average of \$27.31 per year, according to the National Research Bureau.

In checking with the 5 largest cities in Eastern North Dakota, I found that, despite general increases in budgets for salaries, residents pay an average of \$10.82 per year for our police—and North Dakota enjoys the lowest crime rate in the nation.

It follows, of course, that we need less police protection because we have less crime. We have less crime because we have far less of the social and economic conditions that produce criminals. Also, people in smaller towns and cities seem to work better to-

gether, have a higher regard for our neighbors and more pride in our communities.

Finally, as everybody knows, people in North Dakota are just plain better.

MIDEAST SITUATION CONTINUES CRITICAL

The problems that have brought about 3 crises in the past 20 years in the Middle East still remain largely unresolved. The flair up of an actual war in this powder keg region of the world brought to mind a statement I issued almost exactly a year ago urging the Administration to "demonstrate some ability to cope with more than one international problem at a time before—once again—it is too late".

Unfortunately, they were caught off guard again; and despite clear warnings months in advance the White House badly misjudged the seriousness of this pending crisis.

Actually the Administration failed to even have an Ambassador on hand in Cairo for the critical 3 months preceding the crisis.

Despite the summit conference and all the talk about U.S. and Soviet cooperation in keeping the war from spreading, final settlement of the problem is actually further away than at any time since the end of Arab-Israeli war in 1956.

HOODLUMS AGAIN THREATEN AMERICA

So far this summer, major riots have been reported in more than 29 American cities. Professional agitators have roamed about the country preaching hatred and urging violence. Lives have been lost and millions of dollars in property damaged.

Last year, I introduced legislation making interstate travel to incite or encourage these riots a Federal crime punishable by up to 5 years in prison, \$10,000 in fines or both. The proposal was "bottled up" in Committee and the same tactics to hold back this legislation were employed in this Congress. In June a group of us introduced Resolutions to force action on the anti-riot bill and our strategy was successful. The Judiciary Committee released the bill and House Floor action is now scheduled for mid-July.

The rights of every citizen to live safely and peacefully in his own community must be protected from these outside hoodlums, who have no connection with any responsible civil rights organization and seriously damage the cause they pretend to promote.

\$45,000 FOR A FLAGPOLE

When my Appropriations Subcommittee was trying to figure out how the Bureau of Standards managed to spend more than \$107 million on their new headquarters—\$42 million more than expected, I discovered one extravagance that shows how nonthinking bureaucrats are able to waste the taxpayers' money. The 90 foot stainless steel flagpole erected in front of the building costs \$45,000—\$500 per foot! I think "Old Glory" would have waved just as proudly on a more reasonably priced pole.

NATURALIZATION CEREMONY AT MONTICELLO

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on July Fourth, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler addressed the U.S. Court for the Western District of Virginia 1967 Naturalization Ceremony at Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson. In those auspicious surroundings

the Secretary gave us an eloquent reminder of the thought of Jefferson and his rival, Andrew Hamilton. As the Secretary noted, much of what those illustrious gentlemen had to say has applicability to our own situation. I call his remarks to the attention of my colleagues and insert them in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH BY HON. HENRY H. FOWLER

(Remarks of the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, on the occasion of the 1967 Naturalization Ceremony for Applicants for Citizenship, before the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia, under auspices of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, Monticello, Va., July 4, 1967)

As an American, and a Virginian, I am honored to be here with you today. Any thoughtful human being is stirred when he enters this home of the great humanist; any American should feel true pride called forth by the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and this significant occasion; any Virginian asked to participate in a ceremony of this nature at Monticello must say, simply, "I thank you for this honor."

Here at Monticello which housed the person and thought of Thomas Jefferson, some of you today will become new citizens of the United States. You have had no easy time of it in achieving this status. We need you. We need people who want and are willing to work for the things which United States citizenship signifies.

What, essentially, are those things? Plainly stated, they are two in number:

One of them is the right to live in freedom with the natural rights of the individual assured by a system of government based on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—embodying the noblest political concepts ever brought forth by the mind of man.

The other is the responsibility to work for the preservation and development of this country, that system, and the ideals which brought it into being.

Now, which of these comes first—the right or the responsibility? That question was never fully answered in the formative days of our nation. It was never answered because strong men, sincere men, men of skill, enterprise and ability, fought each other to a philosophical draw over which of these concepts should have priority. The battle was joined shortly after these same men, who served together as brothers in the cause of creating the new republic, achieved their immediate goal of winning the war of revolution and achieving American independence.

The problem they tried to decide was inherent in the very idea of government by the people, of the people and for the people. When a people itself truly rules—without a king—without a feudal aristocracy—without an oligarchy—which must come first: rights as individuals or responsibilities to society?

How should the principle that the nation should assure the freedom of the individual be reconciled to the principle that the individual has responsibilities to that nation as something which is greater than himself?

Efforts to answer these questions sometimes crystallized into issues on which passions were aroused to the point that rights and responsibilities instead of being complementary seemed to be placed in direct confrontation. Some of these issues were: freedom of the individual versus organized and centralized power; state and local preference versus national will.

Many able men contributed much to the intellectual ferment and political action that swirled around these questions in the early

days of our nationhood. But none contributed more than Thomas Jefferson, in whose home we are gathered today—and his philosophical and political opponent, Alexander Hamilton, whose portrait was hung in an honored place on the walls of this home by the man whom he sincerely opposed.

As a native Virginian, wholly committed by heritage and conviction to the Jeffersonian tradition, now occupying the post of Secretary of the Treasury in which Hamilton put his theories into practice, I have thought much about these two men, their acts and words.

My conclusion is that history, in weaving its seamless web, is demonstrating that, instead of confronting each other down through the ages in irreconcilable opposition, Jefferson and Hamilton are complementary. Fused properly, their contributions constitute the great American tradition of individual rights and collective responsibilities, indissolubly bound, with the function of government being to aid in the realization of both.

Time does not permit a thoroughgoing analysis of this conclusion—only a few reminders may be noted. Let us remember the Jefferson who penned that shattering Declaration that our rights as human beings are inalienable rights, given to us, along with our existence, by God himself. Let us think of the way in which this man, through this document alone, opened the gates of history so that men could walk through them erect and proud of their condition as men, and away from a past, in Jefferson's phrase, of "ignorance, indigence and oppression."

If Hamilton foresaw a future in which America would be primarily an industrial power, he was right. And if Jefferson saw a future in which the states and localities, along with the individuals of that nation needed the full protection from centralized power that the Constitution and laws could give them, he was right, too.

If Hamilton saw that the new nation would be weak if it were to consist merely of a loosely-knit grouping of communities, his idea was sound. Some centralized authority and direction was needed if the new nation was to achieve sufficient power and resources to defend the rights and promote a realization of the responsibilities of its individual citizens and play a role on the world scene. Can we doubt that Jefferson, after two terms as President and the Napoleonic Wars failed to recognize the need for means to assure the continuing independence and growth of the United States?

And if Jefferson saw that the Constitution, which to a great degree owed its passage to Hamilton's influence, failed to provide assurances of individual liberty in its original form, he was right. And he was right when he fought for the immediate adoption of the first amendments which constituted the Bill of Rights and brought the power of the government back into a more equitable balance with the power of the individual citizen.

I would not assign the principle of rights to Jefferson and responsibility to Hamilton. Rather it seems more accurate to conjoin the emphasis by Jefferson on broad human and moral ends to Jefferson and technical and practical concerns with the role of national economic and political power to Hamilton.

An eminent scholar of the Founding Fathers has defined their respective contributions in these terms:

"The Republican experiment was a success and can still serve as a model to all the world, as the founding fathers hoped, because they, by their joint activity, saw the necessity for the constant balance and tension of power and morals. . . . Jefferson contributed the most searching statement of the equal rights of man in terms that he intended to be a common human faith. Ham-

ilton contributed the most searching statement of the strategic means for establishing the economic basis for a society that could operate as a unity in controlling the resources of nature to increase national productivity. These two in their strong but complementary opposition contributed the strategic ideal of an extensive republic. . . . Their dialectic opposition and argument, together with their strong personal qualities and great talents, resulted in securing the national interest for the common pursuit of happiness." (KOCH, *Power, Morals, and the Founding Fathers*)

The views of these two men, I feel, are important to us today. The very fact that they have never been completely resolved has had an effect upon this country which their exponents might never have dreamed of as being possible at the time:

This might best be defined as motion with stability. I mean this in the sense in which a great ship is enabled to rush forward through the waves of the ocean at tremendous speeds, and yet preserve the stability of its decks because of the paradox that there are two huge tops in its hold, spinning in opposite direction, on opposite sides of the ship.

In this analogy, the ship becomes the United States of America. The rough seas become the real dangers which have threatened and are threatening its progress. The speed of the vessel represents the result of the human energy unleashed by the success of the American Revolution. And the two, huge counter-spinning "tops", or gyroscopic stabilizers, represent the balances provided by the ideas of individual freedom and local rights versus individual responsibility for a strong central government—balances, because they oppose each other with equal strength—balances which have, it turns out, complemented each other, and helped assure the strength and steady progress of our country.

On the day one hundred and ninety-one years ago on which the people of the Thirteen Colonies declared that they were free and independent, every person who agreed with the declaration became a new citizen.

Jefferson became a new citizen. Hamilton became a new citizen. Jefferson was thirty-three at the time he wrote the Declaration; Hamilton, nineteen and a captain of artillery. On that day, George Washington, who had held the command of the Continental Army for just one year, was only forty-four years old.

These facts give us a clue to an understanding of the men who fought to create this country. They were young men. They were young giants. The fact is that they set loose a tide in the affairs of the world that has never stopped running.

They won the war of revolution which guaranteed freedom for the new nation, yes. But further than that, they started a revolutionary movement in world history which has never really ended. It is in progress today, gathering strength and direction as it moves. It has been subject to slowdowns and explosive diversions. But ever since it started it has moved restlessly in pursuit of its goal—that pursuit defined by Jefferson: in brief, it has assured our country the liberty in which we can try to achieve what each man defines for himself as "happiness."

The big achievement of these men was that they took ideas out of the printed pages—off the dusty book shelves and away from the quiet libraries, and put them into startling, physical, actual operation.

They took the concept of individual liberty, guided by rule of the individuals themselves, and fashioned it so that it was no longer a concept but an actuality.

And it worked.

And it is still working.

And it is still revolutionary.

Now, since we are the greatest nation on

earth—since the revolution which started in 1776 has pushed us forward, with ever-increasing momentum to the point at which we can no longer seek—as a nation nor as individuals—to pursue our dreams alone and apart from the world around us—what are the great issues which face us today?

Many of them involve the now familiar domestic problems of assuring the domestic tranquility promised in the Constitutional Preamble. They face us wherever we go—in city streets and urban slums and squalor, in suburban settlement and rural backwater. We are engaged in seeking solutions compatible with the great tradition of rights and responsibilities of U.S. citizenship—for example, the right to equal opportunity must be conjoined to the responsibility for avoiding civil disobedience and violence.

These issues involve the rights and responsibilities of U.S. citizenship, we face of necessity because they physically confront us each day. But there are others beyond our borders where more of a choice seems to be presented. It is those on which I would touch.

Let us all fully understand that the international leadership which we will show in our times will do much to determine the future for the world and for succeeding generations of Americans.

We face many challenges. However, there are three which are surely basic:

First, the effort of Communism to impose its will and extend its influence both by outright aggression and by acts of subversion backed by the threat of aggression.

Second, the responsibilities presented to us in our time by the collapse of colonialism and the emergence of new nations of underprivileged peoples who demand, through some system of government, help in seeking relief from hunger, disease, illiteracy and poverty and the right to the pursuit of happiness in the terms of our Declaration.

Third, excessive nationalism, highly visible today in some of the world's more developed nations as well as—and more understandably—in less developed countries, complicating the efforts of nations to work together—multilaterally—to attack common problems and achieve common objectives.

The work set before us by these issues will demand our energies and efforts for long, hard years to come. If any of us entertain the illusion that these stark problems will disappear, or fall to pieces as the result of sudden or simple solutions, we should have shed it long ago.

Let us face another harsh fact: the responsibilities of today's world are not ours alone—either to determine or to bear. They are determined by the realities and events of the world in which we live—often open to our influence but beyond our control. They are shared by all the other nations of the free world—by all people who, with us, cherish freedom and independence and who labor alongside us to further the cause of peace and justice and freedom and well-being throughout the world.

This is hard work that we face. But let us not face it in fear and trembling. We have good reason to be self-confident without being vainglorious; to be realistically capable of assessing our own ability without being deluded by the thought that we are all-powerful.

For we have done great work in our time. We have helped counter aggression in all its guises, open or concealed, throughout the world, in large countries and in small: in Greece, in Turkey, in the beleaguered Berlin of Germany; in Lebanon, in Iran, in India, in Taiwan, in the Congo, in Laos, and now in South Vietnam. Let those who may feel that this country's revolutionary allegiance to the right of a people to live as they desire stopped with the Revolutionary War look at this record and pause. It represents nothing less than a recitation of the list of battle

honors for freedom we have earned in your time and mine.

We have not sought to act alone and apart from the rest of the world. With other free nations we have forged effective alliances against aggression—through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, through the Southeast Treaty Organization, through the Organization of American States, and through the United Nations.

We have not shrunk from the sacrifices which the times have called forth. We have borne the cost of fighting for liberty both in the measurable material sense and in the immeasurable losses we have taken on the battlefield.

Also in our time, I submit, we have not been found wanting in efforts in support of the right to pursue happiness in the developing nations of the world. Since World War II there has been no great multilateral organization for social and economic development which does not reflect our leadership and our support. Let me run down this roll call of progress: the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund; the World Bank, the Marshall Plan, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Alliance for Progress, and the Asian Development Bank. What opportunities in economic abundance and social progress have these institutions opened up throughout the world? We may never know the full answer in our times. But this we know—that in the postwar decades we have devoted a fair share of our wealth and of our resources through multilateral programs—as well as through our own major governmental foreign assistance programs—to the task of helping others increase their share of the world's abundance. In money we have contributed a total of some \$100 billion of our national wealth to these objectives in addition to many more billions of privately invested capital.

Far more, we have contributed to these objectives with the personal services of thousands of our citizens who have served this cause and are serving it, under strange, and sometimes harsh and dangerous conditions, throughout today's world.

Never before in history has any nation done so much and at so great a cost to help others gain what we gained through our revolution—the promise of the Declaration of Independence.

We may not always have been right. We may not always have been successful. But we have not been found wanting.

And we will not be found wanting today or tomorrow.

We will continue to yield to no nation in patient pursuit of peace and the works of peace. We will continue to demonstrate, as we do in Vietnam, that we have the determination and the weapons to resist aggression.

We must bear the burden and accept the uncertainties and the unpleasantness and the imperfections that come with such a war as that in Vietnam. It is a war of wills as well as a war of weapons. It is a test of our willingness to endure—to surmount—the strain of constant, continuing conflict whose end is never clearly in sight.

At the same time we must continue—together with other developed nations of the Free World—to carry our share of the burden of leadership in the common task of helping the developed nations realize their destiny and enrich the lives of their people in dignity and freedom. We must be willing to take the initiative in new multi-national efforts to promote free trade, to strengthen the international monetary system, and to make available to needy peoples everywhere the opportunity and the means and the incentives for conquering hunger and disease, and for living under the liberating light of education and knowledge.

We seek for others no more than we seek for ourselves—the opportunity for a full and

free life. Abroad as at home, our efforts reflect our awareness that with might must come maturity, with wealth and riches must come wisdom and responsibility, and with success must come sacrifice.

The challenges before us in the days ahead are too great and the world is too small for any of us to retire into an island of purely private concern—into what one observer has called the "cult of private sunshine and secluded complacency."

It is today, almost two centuries after our war of revolution began, that we understand most deeply all that America is and can be—a land where every man can find not only infinite promise but abundant opportunity for a full and free life.

Nine days ago, on the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, a Soviet Communist party document was issued in Moscow which stated, and I quote:

"The revolutionary rejuvenation of the world, begun by the October revolution and embodied in the triumph of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., has been continued by the triumphant Socialist revolutions in other countries. The emergence of the world Socialist system is the most important historic event after the great October Socialist revolution.

"Imperialism, notably U.S. imperialism, was and continues to be the main enemy of the national liberation movement."

The challenges implicit in these false attacks cannot be ignored.

You and I know that "national liberation" as used in the context I have quoted, means nothing more than the coercion of one state by another to change its freedom for a totalitarian system forced on it by a neighbor.

You and I know that we are in the mainstream of a true revolution—and that it began on July 4, 1776—and not 50 years ago last June 25.

I ask to submit a definition of what our revolution is doing. This definition stands on its own terms against the sterile accusations of "imperialism" contained in the Moscow document which I have quoted. The definition which I am going to quote was written on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of our revolution. It was written by Thomas Jefferson, just a few weeks before he died, on July 4, one hundred and forty-one years ago, and it refers to the Declaration of Independence. Here it is:

"May it be to the world . . . the signal of arousing men . . . to assume the blessings and security of self-government. That form which we have substituted restores the free right to the unbounded exercise of reason and freedom of opinion. All eyes are opened, or opening, to the rights of man. The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth, that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few, booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the Grace of God. These are grounds of hope for others. For ourselves, let the annual return of this day forever refresh our recollections to these rights, and an undiminished devotion to them."

Guided by our undiminished devotion to the rights for which the revolution was fought, and by our sense of responsibility which causes us to work to preserve and extend those rights, our nation moves on today.

To you, who today will become citizens of that nation, I emphasize that the rights for which we are fighting, and the responsibility to fight and work for them, are part and parcel of the lives of every man and woman who can say today, "I am a citizen of the United States of America." They are the two sides of a medal you have earned. To have one side of it alone is impossible.

Being a citizen of the United States means that one accepts the entire medal: the inherent rights which go with citizenship, along with the responsibilities and any future in-

dividual hardships which those responsibilities may imply—at the same moment in time.

Whether that medal of citizenship is bright and newly-minted, as will be the case with those offered and accepted today; or whether the medal of citizenship has become dulled because it has been held for a lifetime, it still has these two sides—obverse and reverse—rights and responsibilities; and no one should ever become so accustomed to it—so inured to it—as to ever try to buy his way through life with it on the strength of one side only.

This has not been our history. And as long as our history is guided by this principle, we should have no fear of what the future may hold for us.

A MAJOR THEME FOR 1967 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—REVIEW OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the period of July 16 to 22, 1967, will mark the ninth observance of Captive Nations Week. Since its inception in 1959, when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution—Public Law 86-90—the observance of Captive Nations Week has progressively grown in this country and abroad. One need only scan the book "Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope," and he will appreciate the scope and depth of the event for 1966 alone. Not only in every section of this country has the annual observance taken root, but also in the Republic of China, South Korea, the Philippines, Turkey, India, West Germany, Argentina, and many other free world countries.

We cannot ever afford to abandon the 1 billion captive humans in the Red empire. The present tendency to neglect the captive nations is both immoral and harmful to the vital interests of our Nation. In view of impericocolonialist Russian operations in Vietnam, North Korea, the Middle East, and Cuba, the time has arrived to examine and review fully our policy toward the U.S.S.R. The scourge of Soviet Russian impericocolonialism has yet to be highlighted in the United Nations.

Every Member has recently received the pamphlet "Review of U.S. Policy Toward the U.S.S.R.: A Major Theme for the 1967 Captive Nations Week." Written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, the article emphasizes that no such review has ever been undertaken by Congress and that one is long overdue, particularly in the light of recent developments. The article contains a proposed resolution which I, for one, support and have submitted because it is well substantiated by fact. I hope many of my colleagues will do likewise in celebration of this ninth observance of Captive Nations Week. So that the general public may become familiar with this subject, I include the Dobriansky article in full in the RECORD:

[Reprinted from The Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. XXIII, No. 1, spring, 1967]

REVIEW OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE U.S.S.R.: A MAJOR THEME FOR THE 1967 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

During the period of July 16-22 millions of Americans will again observe in one form or another the annual Captive Nations Week. As in the past few years, they will be joined by increasing numbers of peoples in other lands—in Asia, Latin America, Western Europe, and Africa—where the annual observance has also taken root. Developed into a vital tradition since its inception in 1959, Captive Nations Week is entering into its ninth year of observance, and each year has exceeded in breadth and depth all preceding years.¹ The full spectrum of the 1966 observance, here and abroad, is well described in book form, and thousands of copies have already entered into circulation both nationally and internationally.²

AMERICA'S BREED OF PAVLOVIAN DOGS

Captive Nations Week has from the start proven to be a national forum for the discussion and evaluation of U.S. foreign policy, current trends in Cold War developments, and forecasts of Red strategy and tactics in the immediate future. It has become the midway point in any calendar year for the crystallization of thought and action bearing on the Red Empire and its dozens of captive nations. Moscow and its syndicated associates make no bones about their aim to have the Week eliminated, and in our country several circles have responded to Pavlov's bell, salivating with the same desire in behalf of what they call "detente," "peaceful coexistence," "easing of tensions," "relaxation" and other strikingly appropriate physio-psychological terms for the Pavlovian experience. Few will forget *Izvestia's* compliments to the editor of *The Washington Post* for his salivated response, which it characterized as a "realistic understanding of the matter" and then poured on the following for nuclearizing effect: "In a situation where the relation of power has shifted to the side of Socialism, the U.S. cannot force the peoples of the Socialist countries to adopt its standards without risking the holocaust of a world war. How long do the Capitol and the White House intend to amuse the world with their absurd plans?"³ And the dog is supposed to rest euphorically until the bell rings again.

As in many other spheres of Cold War activity, the Red attempt to cultivate the breed of Pavlovian dogs with regard to Captive Nations Week is persistent and, in individual cases, successful. In 1966, for example, Radio Riga blurted out, "We recall a meeting with Shabad, a correspondent of *The New York Times*, after the 25th anniversary of Soviet Latvia. He said he had never written about any such 'Week' and would not do it in the future because it was all lies."⁴ Interestingly enough, this controlled propaganda agency hammered away at the Week on six occasions. Here are a couple of samples: "The announcement that the so-called Captive Nations Week has been proclaimed, reaches us from the USA like a demagogical ghost . . . It cannot be fully ignored because such manifestations have become an important part of US political attitude (July 17,

¹ For a capsule account see author's article, "Forget The Captive Nations?", *Washington Report*, American Security Council, July 18, 1966.

² *Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope*. National Captive Nations Committee, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, Washington, D.C. pp. 310.

³ *Izvestia*, Moscow, July 15, 1964.

⁴ Radio Riga, Latvian S.S.R., July 23, 1966.

1966). Three days later—"These miserable 'Captive Weeks,' proclaimed officially by Washington, serve not only the purpose of the cold war. The USA is endeavoring to pose, by this means, as a guardian of freedom and right, at a time when she conducts a sanguinary war against the Vietnamese people." Were he alive, Ivan Petrovich Pavlov, the famous Russian physiologist, would be aghast at the psycho-political applications of his theories on conditioned reflexes.

Especially illuminating is the fact that last year Moscow itself changed gears in radical departure as concerns its attitude toward the Week. After seven years of tirades and vehement denunciations it decided to try the technique of mute silence. This stance contrasted sharply with the past and particularly with Suslov's 1965 blast, "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagoguery of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of the nations that have escaped from their yoke." Undoubtedly, by the silent technique the boys in *Agitprop* hoped to minimize the impact of the Week and at the same time further their pretensions of peaceableness and conversion to "good and soft communism." They left the denunciatory task to puppets and subsidiaries, instead. For example, a Red periodical sought to tie the captive nations issue with anti-Semitism, referring to "criminals" who "are active in the organizations of the so-called 'captive nations' . . . have their own press and conduct war-inciting activities through demonstrations, picket lines, etc."⁵ The Reds are apparently concerned that the "captive nations" organizations are often connected with similar organizations in other countries in Europe and Latin America.⁶

If one bothers to scan the book on Captive Nations Week mentioned earlier, he cannot but be impressed by the fact that the spiritual communion extends to all continents of the world. In 1966, for instance, President J. Onganía of Argentina joined the many Chiefs of State in issuing a Captive Nations Week proclamation, urging government institutions and the people to mark the week by appropriate observance. Similar proclamations were issued by Argentine mayors, such as Mayor J. Schettini of Buenos Aires, and Cardinal A. Caggiano devoted a special solemn Mass for the captive nations in the Cathedral of that city. For the first time, too, Australia launched the observance, with Minister V. Meckman and others participating in rallies in Melbourne and elsewhere. Much to Moscow's chagrin, no doubt, the truths about the captive nations in the face of all the alleged "tremendous changes" in the Red Empire will not be allowed to be brushed under the rug of diplomatic expediency and make-believe.

The Week has also served the very important purpose of highlighting the numerous myths a number of Americans have been pavoized into. For one, not a year goes by without the need for impressing upon our people the nonsensical conceptions still nurtured by many as to the nature and composition of the Soviet Union. Here is an outstanding example of misguided notions commercialized into the millions: "Geographically the largest single nation in the world, the land traditionally known as Russia sprawls across one-seventh of the earth's surface. . . . After the U.S. this once-backward nation now produces more steel, oil, electric power, aluminum and cement than any other country. In 1949 the USSR became the second nation to produce an atom bomb. . . ." In

rudimentary fact, neither the Czarist Russian Empire—the so-called traditionally known Russia—nor the USSR has ever been a "nation," and the present empire's economic advances rest on broad foundations of Russian imperio-colonialist exploitation of over a dozen captive non-Russian nations and countries in the USSR, but one couldn't know these fundamental facts from this superficial, commercialized effort to "inform" the American reader. The untiring dispenser of Kennan's Fables spreads similar nonsense in garbled, sophisticated style, but fortunately few legislators are taken in by his involute language and weak judgments, notwithstanding the mass of conceptual confusion that underlies them.⁸ It is a pity, indeed, that through the club alliance in the Department of State the case of Svetlana Stalina was initially entrusted to the dispenser's care, but despite the fears of the club the situation can be properly sanitized by several Congressional hearings.⁹ A vaunted "Russian expert" is scarcely a competent analyst of one who can be tested on her Georgian background.

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CURRENT ILLUSION

In the course of the 1967 Captive Nations Week several other myths, dominant wishful thoughts, and glaring omissions of thought will doubtlessly be underscored. One, of course, is the myth that the so-called satellites in Central Europe are progressing toward "independence." For a striking expression of this myth, read this: "With the exception of East Germany, Russia has no more satellites, in the sense the term was used for so long. Rumania has defied her, as did Yugoslavia and Albania years ago. Czechoslovakia has proposed Eastern European military arrangements that exclude the Soviet Union. To keep her troops in Europe, Russia has been forced to negotiate status-of-forces agreements, not unlike the ones we have around the world. Where she used to be able to commandeer the production of Eastern Europe for her own use, Russia now sends her raw materials to Hungary and Czechoslovakia and Poland, to supply their growing industries."¹⁰

Little has it occurred to the Senator grasping at these minor, accidental changes that each of these parts of the Red Empire is ultimately dependent for its survival under a Red regime upon the strength and power of the USSR. Also, the points he raises are given to other more accurate interpretations. The Rumanian contingent of the syndicate, for example, has defied the northern industrial sphere of captive Central Europe rather than what he calls "Russia." In short, there is no shred of substantial evidence that supports this convenient myth and, if as a case in point, the Senator wants to learn about Poland, he would do well to read the excellent summary on developments there as provided by one legislator who states, "Independence and liberalism in Soviet satellites—if Poland is typical of them—are myths."¹¹ Needless to say, as concerns the captive nations, the peoples themselves, nothing the Senator has said alters, or will alter, their basic state of captivity under the reign of the interlocking, though sometimes squabbling, Red syndicate.

Concerning Vietnam, those who have participated in the Captive Nations Week observances have consistently upheld Presi-

dent Johnson's actions in that heated arena of the Cold War. Criticisms have been directed, however, at the scope of his policy there and the implementation of our measures. Vietnam is a sterling example of our unpreparedness in the Cold War—too little and too late, followed as usual by desperate, last-minute recourse to military arms. At present, our situation there has assumed scandalous proportions, and when we are told that we can look forward to a long, drawn-out struggle, this is really the measure of the price facing us for our Cold War negligence in the past, from 1954 on.

The plight of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese will again be highlighted. It is strange, indeed, that few of our leaders ever discuss this troublesome subject. Yet it is crucial to our winning the war in South Vietnam. Canada's diplomat and former representative on the International Control Commission for Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, Theodore B. Blockley, has significantly pointed out, "Many of the North Vietnamese whom I met expressed the hope that one day the Americans would 'again' liberate them from tyranny and oppression. The previous liberation, in their minds, was from the Japanese."¹² Characterizing the ICC as not only impotent but a "fraud," the Canadian diplomat has revealed how thousands of North Vietnamese had stormed the Canadian delegation's office in the mistaken belief that exit visas could be obtained. Lagging miserably in ways and means of psycho-political warfare, we haven't even begun to scratch the potentialities of the captive North Vietnamese in the war with totalitarian Hanoi, and this largely with free Vietnamese and Korean means in the spirit of "Asia For Free Asians."

Another chief theme of the 1967 Captive Nations Week observance is the fraudulence of the Russian Bolshevik revolution. Moscow and its associates are planning a tremendous propaganda show this coming November, celebrating the 50th anniversary of this tragic event. Though scarcely any Western journalist or commentator surmised it, even the designation of the new USSR spaceship—"Soyuz"—is symbolically tied up with the forthcoming propaganda show. The emphasis on the "union" of the USSR will be in the forefront to conceal the captivity and exploitation of the numerous non-Russian nations in that artificial state. The sharp contrast these past 50 years between expansive Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, particularly in the USSR, and the almost complete decolonization process in the Free World should be of basic educational worth to our citizenry.

For those under the powerful Pavlovian influence there will also be the need to stress the anti-anticommunism drive of the Red Syndicate, the deepening reality of the Cold War, and Red economic strategy in the whole East-West trade issue. Those who wishfully think that concepts of captive nations, Red Empire, communist conspiracy and so forth are rigid and deep-frozen representations of thought should begin familiarizing themselves with Red literature. Actually, such people are mental throwbacks to the mid-30s and appetizing meat for the Pavlovian exercise. To mention only one, Moscow's *International Affairs* is replete with articles on exploiting "intellectuals," non-Communists, and liberals in the West for the destruction of anti-Communism. The same applies to those who through conditioned reflexes are under the illusion that the Cold War has ended or is on the verge of ending. The illusion itself is a prime product of Moscow's Cold War management, and this at a time when we are deeply steeped in a heated sector of the Cold War, namely Vietnam itself. Last September,

⁸ "Kennan's Version of Why Communist World Is Split," *The Sunday Star*, Washington, D.C., February 5, 1967, p. C-3.

⁹ For a timed and planted article see Murray Marder, "U.S. Fears Svetlana Hill 'Circus,'" *The Washington Post*, April 23, 1967.

¹⁰ Senator Edward M. Kennedy, "Europe And The Next Generation," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 21, 1967, p. 10468.

¹¹ Congressman Paul Findley, "Poland: The Myth of the Independent Satellite," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 31, 1967, p. 2108.

¹² Associated Press, New York, February 6, 1967.

⁵ Chaim Suller, "Anti-Semitism In The USA," *Political Affairs*, Fall Issue, 1966, p. 26.

⁶ Ibid, p. 28.

⁷ The Editors of Life, *Handbook of the Nations and International Organizations*, Life World Library, New York, 1966, p. 14.

Pravda summed up the matter this way: "The ways and methods of revolution embrace the whole arsenal of methods in the class struggle . . . including armed struggle." By class struggle is meant divide and conquer in behalf of ultimate Soviet Russian imperio-colonialist power, and the struggle proliferates with varying intensity on every continent, including our own country.

To facilitate Moscow's world-wide Cold War operations, especially in Vietnam, by liberalizing our trade with its empire borders on psycho-political lunacy. The present drive for such liberalization is also a shining example of our Cold War ineptitude, and in the end will result in desperate measures of military intervention, as seen in Vietnam. The matter of trade was brought up time and time again in the fight over the Senate's ratification of the US-USSR Consular Convention, which was the first part of a package deal that spells only a series of American Cold War blunders and losses. It is regrettable that Senator Dirksen, who could have won great distinction in blocking the ratification, now thinks the USSR has made "a new ball game" for the East-West trade issue by signing a pact in March with Red China to step up the flow of war materials to North Vietnam.¹² No, the ball game still is the old one, and it was best shown during the hearings on the Consular Treaty. That episode alone should convince us of the dire need for a full review now of US policy toward the USSR, rather than for us to bounce haphazardly from issue to issue as the winds blow tactically from the East.

PARAMOUNT SYMBOL OF U.S. POLITICO-CULTURAL LAG

To appreciate how much narrow domestic politics and pressure were exerted on this basic Consular Treaty issue, we can start with the concerned declamations of a lady Senator who changed her mind at the last capricious moment. Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine solemnly declared, "I find it difficult to rationalize making a consular treaty with a nation that is helping the enemy kill American service personnel. This situation is completely contrary to the alleged treaty goal of the development of more friendly relations between the United States and Russia."

Concise and taken alone, this statement points to the three essential aspects of the controversy that had significantly surrounded the issue of the U.S. Senate's ratification of the treaty. These basic aspects are: the poor timing for the treaty's ratification, the acute doubtfulness of its advancing "more friendly relations," and the flagrant misconceptions (e.g., USSR is "Russia") justifying the pressing need for a full and thorough review of U.S. policy toward the USSR.

The treaty could not have been pushed for ratification at a worse conceivable time. Signed on June 1, 1964, the convention had not been put to the test of popular interest and criticism until the summer of 1965 when an attempt was made to railroad it through the Senate for ratification. The attempt failed, but was repeated this past January, only to fail again as increasing numbers of Americans, concerned with the USSR's heavy support of Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam, demanded at least open hearings on the treaty. The situation in Vietnam was radically different in 1964 than it is now. Americans weren't being killed daily by Russian and other communist arms as they have been in mounting numbers since 1965. In March of this year about 100,000 tons of war supplies were shipped into Haiphong, the chief port of North Vietnam, by Red ships from the USSR and the so-called "independent" satellites of Central Europe.

In contemporary circumstances it was not only difficult, as Senator Smith said, to rationalize Senate consent of this treaty, but it was also irrational to accept a pact which by substantive analysis would guarantee a clear, net psycho-political advantage to our prime enemy in Vietnam. The war in Vietnam would not last long if Moscow and its Red associates in Eastern Europe were, in the interest of genuine peace, to cut off their flow of critical war supplies to Hanoi. In this ultimate sense of sustaining power in the war, Moscow, rather than Hanoi, is our chief enemy in Vietnam. Well over 80 per cent of the high-powered items used by the North Vietnamese totalitarians is furnished by Moscow. Even now, long-range Russian weapons, the 140-mm. rockets, have been provided the Viet Cong to intensify the decimation of American lives.

"Subtle" rationalization in support of the treaty and the next step, liberalized trade with the USSR, had gone so far in Washington that it is being argued, "It is not to American advantage to have the flow of Russian aid to Hanoi reduced."¹⁴ The twisted logic of this position is that Hanoi's greater dependence on USSR support as against Red Chinese aid would enable Moscow to influence its compatriot aggressors into peace negotiations. It is small wonder that letters to Senators from citizens across the nation, many of them with loved ones in the war, have ranged in the ratio of 200 to 1 against a treaty with the prime enemy. Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois, who was elected to represent his alert constituents, actually boasted of defying a ratio of 7,000 to 46 in opposition to the pact.¹⁵ Despite the feelings of many Republicans in the House of Representatives, this and similar actions in the Senate killed the possibility of making this episode an issue for Republicans in the 1968 Presidential election.¹⁶ Only a 3rd Party candidate can make it a live issue.

Following the open, public hearings on the Consular Treaty, an obviously less "subtle" but further rationalization for Senate consent was the CIA's great desire to have the pact ratified. The new pitch to undecided Senators was the opportunity the treaty would provide for broadened CIA operations in the USSR. This so-called "confidential matter" changed the minds of several legislators as well as a few national leaders who had been previously against ratification. The rationalization only demonstrated how few really had bothered to seek convincing answers to poignant questions and points raised during the public hearings. Of course, a number were motivated to favor the treaty by political considerations far remote from its substantive contents, as next year's presidential elections, the open housing amendment, internal Party problems and the like.

The February hearings on the treaty established three general facts which should serve as solid lessons for America's alert citizenry in the future. As shown in the proceedings of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations, the three facts are: (1) the clear inability of the treaty's proponents to meet the most fundamental points of criticism against its ratification, (2) a patent lack of awareness concerning the psycho-political ramifications of the pact, and (3) as indicated by outmoded preconceptions used, a deficient and stumbling understanding of the Soviet Union itself, which, behind the facade of "peaceful coexistence" is not only our prime enemy in Vietnam but also the chief insti-

gator of anti-American attitudes and activity in Western Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America.¹⁷ These easily substantiated facts cast grave doubt on the objective of "more friendly relations" that the treaty is supposed to advance.

One major objection is that the treaty is superfluous and represents a sham performance of improving relations with the Soviet Union. It is part of the present concocted make-believe in detenting the USSR. The objection is firmly based on the Roosevelt-Litvinov exchanges of 1933 that established diplomatic relations between the United States and the USSR. Aside from adventitious references made to a proposed consular convention then and an exemplifying German-USSR Agreement of 1925, Litvinov expressly agreed to the protection of American citizens touring or residing in the USSR in a November 16, 1933 communication. It reads: "Furthermore, I desire to state that such rights will be granted to American nationals immediately upon the establishment of relations between our two countries."

Predicated on the establishment of simple relations, this agreement was never legally abrogated and thus, in international law, has remained in force to the present day. Supreme Court decisions, such as *U.S. vs. Belmont* in 1937 and *U.S. vs. Pink* in 1942, as well as a case in New York, are founded on the exchanges. The so-called Russian concession on notification and access in the present treaty is really no concession at all. This right should have been demanded long ago on the basis of the '33 agreements. When this vital point was brought up in the hearings, the chairman, Senator J. W. Fulbright, rightly admitted—for the record shows it—that the State Department was never challenged on this. And this after two years of concern with the treaty! Yet, following the hearings the State Department minced the truth in response to the Committee's inquiry when it predicated the whole Litvinov exchange and declaration of protection on the German-USSR Agreement of 1925.¹⁸ It is amazing that no one in the Senate challenged this stratagem.

Another important legal objection is based on the misrepresentations in the treaty itself, which are clearly indicative of the askewed preconceptions dominating our officials who framed the pact. The treaty is replete with the notion of a "Soviet national," "a national of the sending state," "the national flag of the sending state," and "the national coat-of-arms of the sending state." Even on the basis of the USSR Constitution, not to mention rudimentary political realities in the USSR, there is no such political animal in existence as a "Soviet national," nor are there such objects in existence as a "national flag" or a "national coat-of-arms" of the USSR. These concepts are applicable to the United States, which is a nation-state, but they are myths as concerns the USSR, which is an empire-state made up of numerous, different national republics.

In a court of law, a contract of this sort, dealing in part with mythical objects, would be thrown out for its crass misrepresentations. But worse still, from a psycho-political point of view, Moscow surely must gloat over the unbridged gap of understanding shown by our professed bridge-builders with regard to the many non-Russian nations in the USSR. On the one hand, it naturally welcomes this treaty and its fantastic conceptual contents, for by all evidence the treaty is essentially a diplomatic affirmation of Moscow's imperium in imperio, the Soviet Union itself; on the other hand, it will unquestion-

¹⁴ *The Christian Science Monitor*, February 23, 1967.

¹⁵ "Consular Pact Passes 1st Test," *The Evening Star*, March 10, 1967, p. A-5.

¹⁶ Rep. John M. Ashbrook, "The Consular Convention With The Soviet Union—An Issue For The 1968 Presidential Campaign," *The Congressional Record*, January 26, 1967, p. 1775.

¹⁷ See on pact Karl E. Meyer, "Hanoi's Move In Sino-Soviet Pact Is Cited," *The Washington Post*, April 20, 1967.

¹⁸ *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*. Hearings, Committee On Foreign Relations, United States Senate, USGPO, Washington, D.C., 1967.

¹⁹ See *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, March 10, 1967, p. 6269.

ably use the treaty in its dealings with the non-Russian nations as prime evidence of the fact that they have little to look forward to from a country that in one breath speaks of "friendship with all peoples and in the next doesn't even recognize their distinctive national identities, which Moscow at least nominally does.

Aggravating all this further is the branch principle of consularism, the instrument that supposedly attests to the "national" integrity of the USSR. Regardless of the specious distinction made between the treaty as a body of guidelines and subsequent negotiations on consulate locations, the very proffer of this principle in regard to the multinational USSR reduces the non-Russian republics in that state to a territorial expression of "Russia," negates their distinctive national identities and sovereign popular wills, and creates an additional legal mess where in the United Nations our representatives recognize both *de jure* and *de facto* two original, sovereign Charter members, Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Byelorussia. Again, on this point the State Department played on the weakness of many a Senator with a high-pressure memorandum that blatantly raised the question "Does the Convention prejudice the position of subject peoples incorporated against their will into the Soviet Union?" and then glibly answered it, "No, it does not."¹⁹

Plainly, if more windows are desired in "Russia," if mutual understanding toward all peoples were a sincere objective, and if we had the foresight to avoid these and other psycho-political disadvantages of the treaty, we would wisely consider the realistic alternative of setting up embassies in Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, and Kazakh Turkestan. This is accommodated by Article 18a of the USSR constitution. It would also be a real test of Moscow's desire for peaceful relations. Moreover, on a reciprocal basis with their embassies in Washington, we would be able to cover their espionage and subversive political activity far more effectively than with "Russian" consulates in Chicago and other cities. It is noteworthy that the State Department has consistently opposed the far more advantageous embassy idea because of the presence of more communists here; yet, with the consulate idea, it would allow for more of them in more vulnerable areas of the country.

Significantly, none of these points and criticisms were challenged by the treaty's proponents. The amateur show staged by Senators Morton and Percy avoided these points entirely, confused "Russia" and the USSR with "the Soviets" throughout and came up with some fantastic interpretations as, for example, Latin American states won't follow us because they haven't in the past, not recognizing that Moscow just began to exert pressure there in a major way in the past ten years.²⁰ Neither have they or other proponents answered the additional criticism bearing on the real protection of Americans traveling in the USSR. Superficially bandying about the 20,000 figure of Americans touring the USSR annually and the 250 "Soviet nationals" here measures neither the relative intelligence worth of the projected ratio nor the scope of the hoped-for protection. With greater freedom of movement here the specially assigned 250 may in these terms be equivalent or exceed in value the 20,000 there, most of them given to typical American tourism and guided, of course, by overseeing Intourist. Furthermore, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the treaty's notification and access provision is no guarantee whatsoever against the continuation of arbitrary arrests of American nationals who, if they are important enough

to Moscow, can easily be brainwashed in the span of three days. As in the recent Kazan-Komarek case, such Americans can be arrested and held incommunicado by the Russians indirectly on the terrain of their outer empire, in Poland or Czechoslovakia. It is noteworthy that almost immediately after the Senate's inept ratification the State Department released a brochure warning Americans, in effect, that travel in the USSR is at their own risk.²¹

The espionage and subversion disadvantages of the treaty were also not met with adequate explanation. The shell game of manipulating the 15 or 20 figure of Russian consular personnel expected here conceals the net disadvantage we face because of several reasons. One is that well spy-trained Russians would enjoy a larger pond to fish in here than we there. Second, the efficiency of their spy effectiveness is generally conceded to be greater. Third, a point which was completely overlooked though it is already well founded in this country, the Russians will have expanded opportunities for coercion, blackmail of U.S. citizens with relatives in the USSR, bribery, and sundry subversive tactics directed against ethnic groups; and this with unprecedented diplomatic immunity covering felonies such as murder and kidnapping. It doesn't require much imagination to see how little or no reciprocity there exists in this for us.

No reply could be found for the additional criticism that the treaty opens up a Pandora's box of Soviet Russian pressure against every free government in Latin America. With the supposed leader of the Free World extending this benefit to the rulers of the Kremlin, what Latin American government could refuse their request for a similar convention. Beginning with 15 or 20 here we may well end up with several hundred additional Russian operatives in the hemisphere, cloaked with diplomatic immunity and at a time when many of our own officials have been warning us to expect stepped-up Red subversion south of the border. The Morton reply mentioned above is about as lame as one would expect, for we're in the 60's not the 30's.

Finally, Secretary of State Rusk was honest to point out that one objective for the treaty's ratification is its contribution to "increasing trade between our two countries." This is just the first step, a part of a large package. Piercing the vagaries and slogans of "normalizing relations," "advancing peace," "improving communications" and so forth, an internal analysis of the treaty results in a grave disadvantage for us. It will even be graver if our citizens permit the next part of the package deal to be handled as in slipshod a manner as the first one was. For, on trade, we will only be repeating our tragic economic errors of the 20's and 30's in regard to the USSR. Flushed with a supposed victory on ratification, Senator Morton is talking antiquated nonsense when he states, "There are strong indications that a new era is beginning for the peoples of Russia and Eastern Europe. It is in our national interest that we make sure that American ideas and skill become a part of that changing world."²² He reveals not only his complete ignorance of the Cold War but also of the record of U.S. trade with totalitarian powers.

Enough has been shown here to indicate the glaring politico-cultural lag existing in our country with regard to the USSR. It is almost like an ineradicable blind-spot for some legislators and others alike. However, the matter of accommodating Russian consulates in this country still is not resolved. Proponents of the treaty repeated ad

nauseum the point that ratification of the treaty does not necessarily mean the establishment of Russian consulates here, which is a subject for further negotiations. Also, in rationalizing his switch Senator Dirksen stressed emphatically that the "treaty would not enable the Soviet Union to establish a consulate in Chicago or any other city."²³ Not only this, but the citizenry was informed that Dirksen "was assured by Secretary of State Dean Rusk that 'appropriate Congressional Committees' would be consulted before a U.S. consulate was established in Russia as well as clearance with community officials before a Soviet consulate could be located in this country."²⁴ This agreement opens up a whole new area on the issue, and Mayor Daley of Chicago has already declared that his city wants no Russian consulate. As we approach Captive Nations Week, pressure is building up to have other Mayors of our port-cities declare themselves along the same lines. It will be interesting to see what counter-pressure will be brought to bear to overcome the agreement.

TIME FOR REVIEW OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE U.S.S.R.

The hearings on the Consular Convention have shown beyond question of doubt our pressing need for a full and thorough review of U.S. policy toward the USSR. On the scale of politico-diplomatic calculation the treaty definitely does not rest on a quid pro quo basis; the net disadvantage is ours. What makes the situation worse is that we, rather than the Russians, have pressed for it; and though the President could initiate negotiations for consulates without a treaty, it has been felt that at least the Senate should assume part of this responsibility. But the treaty is a vestigial remain of the 30's when our knowledge of "Russia" and its global ambitions and operations was quite wanting. Judging by the preconceptions and concepts displayed in the hearings, there still is the want, but will the need for such a review be recognized?

Never in our history has such a review been undertaken to eliminate the conceptual cobwebs which misdirect us into net disadvantageous positions. In part, Senator Roman Hruska has sensed this need in stating that this treaty and other measures "are going to affect the basic philosophy of our relations with the Communist countries." There can be no better time than now to do what we have never done before but should have done long ago.

The author offers a proposed resolution which, in content, can be easily documented and substantiated on the basis of the misconceptions and contradictions to facts uttered by our foremost leaders in the past twenty years, exclusively in relation to the Soviet Union. We rightly pride ourselves in this country on seizing upon the innovative, the new, and the changing. It will be interesting to see whether, with courage and foresight, we can bring into full public view and for unprecedented examination and assessment our policy toward the USSR. The proposed measure reads as follows:

"RESOLUTION ON REVIEW OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE U.S.S.R."

"A resolution providing for a thorough review of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R."

"Whereas in his 1967 State of the Union Message the President declared 'the genius of the American political system has always been expressed through creative debate that offers reasonable alternatives; and

"Whereas U.S. policy toward the USSR is most crucial to the issue of global peace or war, and the cumulative evidence of the past

¹⁹ "US-USSR Consular Convention, Questions and Answers," Department of State, February 6, 1967, p. 7.

²⁰ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 9, 1967, pp. 5992-5996.

²¹ Hon. John R. Rarick, "Traveling to Communist Russia?", daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 10, 1967, p. A1676-77.

²² "Morton Asks Widening of Red Contacts," The Washington Post, April 4, 1967.

²³ "Consul Pact Will Not Aid Spies: Dirksen," Chicago Tribune, February 20, 1967.

²⁴ "Dirksen Says GOP To Back Consul Pact," The Washington Post, March 1, 1967.

two decades, including Greece, Iran, Korea, Cuba, the Congo, the Dominican Republic, and Vietnam, casts a reasonable and heavy doubt on the peace-insuring efficacy of the pursued policy; and

"Whereas there has never been a thorough Congressional review of our policy toward the USSR, even at levels below another Great Debate, examining and illuminating questionable preconceptions, arrant conceptual confusions, contradictions to fact and principle, and high-level counter-contradictions that have surrounded this policy; and

"Whereas proposed particular measures, such as the U.S.-USSR Consular Convention, U.S.-Soviet trade, cultural exchange agreements, etc., depend for their accurate and proper evaluation on the soundness or no of the underlying assumptions and criteria in the general policy; and

"Whereas these assumptions and criteria have been too frequently conveyed by official assertions that are patently contrary to fact and/or principle, and especially at this time deserve to be openly and thoroughly examined; and

"Whereas, to cite one example, on the highest level an old, Imperial Czarist Russian usage, albeit fictional to present conditions, has been revived in the thought 'The common interests of the peoples of Russia and the United States are many'; and

"Whereas, by way of further example, the notion expressed by one of our Presidents, 'no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Russian suffered in the course of the Second World War,' contradicts the facts that the ravaged territories in the USSR were largely non-Russian and the losses of Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Armenians and other non-Russian nationals were equal if not greater; and

"Whereas, in additional contradiction to fact, more than one national leader has voiced the mythical constructions of '200 million Russians' in existence and the USSR as 'Russia'; and

"Whereas, to mention another apt example, a high-level conception misjudges 'areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia' as constituting 'traditional parts of the Soviet Union . . . an historical state,' which factually has been in existence for only forty-five years; and

"Whereas, in sharp contradiction to this quoted misconception, an outstanding official U.S. statement in the United Nations emphasizes: 'An independent Ukrainian Republic was recognized by the Bolsheviks in 1917' and later 'with the help of the Red Army, a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was established and incorporated into the USSR'; also, 'In 1920, the Soviet army invaded, and Armenian independence, so long awaited, was snuffed out,' also, 'In 1921, the Red Army came to aid of Communists rebelling against the independent State of Georgia and installed a Soviet regime'; and

"Whereas these selected examples of basic confusion, contradictions of reality, and official counter-contradictions are compounded by growing doubts related to operating principles, double-standards, and policy inconsistencies, even at a time when the USSR and its syndicated Red associates supply the totalitarian Red regime in North Vietnam to kill increasing numbers of American defenders of independent South Vietnam; and

"Whereas, on the basis of these and numerous other points of evidence, it is not inconceivable that the forthcoming 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, which gave rise to Soviet Russian imperialism and its world-wide aggressive ambitions, might elicit in 'the spirit of peaceful coexistence' harmful expressions virtually equating this fraudulent revolution with our own American Revolution and its symbolization of national independence, individual liberty, and freedom; and

"Whereas a genuine policy of peaceful coexistence means progressive reciprocity, substantial reduction of barriers year by year, the absence of controlled movements, an intensified understanding between nations in the USSR and the United States, and surcease from indirect provocation in other parts of the Free World, none of which has been realized in the past decade; and

"Whereas a policy founded on basic misconceptions, myths, and internal contradictions generates a grand illusion which in the long run can only lead to disastrous results for our independence and national security and certainly, in the short run and with reference to the nations in the USSR, fails to validate the President's declaration in his 1966 State of the Union Message: 'The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions. . . . We follow this principle by encouraging the end of colonial rule.' Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the United States of America (or the House of Representatives) in Congress assembled, That a complete and thorough review of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R. be undertaken. The review shall be conducted by means of public hearings, designated studies relevant to all essential aspects of the subject, and scheduled symposia consisting of Members of the Senate (the House), representatives of interested areas in our Government, and invited participants from the private sector of our society. The results of this comprehensive review will be made available by publication and other media to the American public. On the basis of the results the Senate (the House) shall determine what 'reasonable alternatives' exist to our present policy toward the USSR."

In the midst of many foolish notions being expressed almost daily with reference to our commitment in Vietnam and the obvious inconsistency, nay irrationality, of policies pursued by the Administration in relation to different but inseparable sectors of the Red Empire, the American people, who in the last resort are called upon to sustain the price of policy misjudgments, are at least entitled to this kind of review—a truly first Great Debate on U.S. policy toward the USSR. Will courage, foresight, and open-mindedness prevail? This is the question for Captive Nations Week, 1967—or are we content to pursue make-believe measures based on crass misconceptions, Pavlovianized reactions, and insular political considerations?

STAMP TO COMMEMORATE THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States.

My bill authorizes the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of independence of the Baltic States. The stamp would be of such denomination and design as the Postmaster General would determine.

The bill would provide for sale of the stamps to commence on February 16, 1968, which is the 50th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, the first of the Baltic States to gain its independence.

The illegal and oppressive Soviet Russian control of the Baltic States is one of the great tragedies of modern history and we should take every possible step to dramatize the desire of the Baltic peoples for the restoration of their legitimate independence. I believe that the issuance of a special postage stamp will effectively and dramatically demonstrate that the American people and our Government stand behind the perseverance of the Baltic peoples in their continued hopes for restoration of their freedom under independent governments truly reflecting their national traditions and histories.

STATEMENT OF RUMANIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet involvement in the Middle East war dramatizes a fact that many in the United States had conveniently ignored; namely, the persistence of the Soviet Union in attempting to expand its colonial holdings. It is obvious that the basic motivation of the Soviet Union is to seize control of a number of Arab States depriving the citizens of freedom and producing direct Communist territorial holds in the Middle East. Therefore, it is with great interest that we note the effective and accurate analysis of the Soviet Middle East scheme by knowledgeable observers and students of history.

One very forceful group maintaining legitimate concern over Communist control of Rumania and other Eastern European lands is the Rumanian National Committee. In a special meeting on June 23, 1967, this group issued a special statement on the Middle East crisis which I deem of special significance and place in the Record as a continuation of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF THE RUMANIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE IN CONNECTION WITH THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS AND THE DECLARATIONS MADE IN THE UNITED NATIONS ASSEMBLY BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE U.S.S.R., JUNE 23, 1967

During the United Nations Assembly debates on the Middle East crisis, the Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., Mr. Kosygin, declared that the Soviet Union defends—and demands that all others, too, respect—the independence and territorial integrity of all nations. We quote:

"While upholding the rights of peoples to self-determination, the Soviet Union just as resolutely condemns the attempts by any state to conduct an aggressive policy toward the other countries, a policy of seizure of foreign lands and subjugation of the people living there." (U.N. Assembly, June 19, 1967.)

In this connection, it is most appropriate to recall the following solemn declaration made by the Soviet government on April 3, 1944:

"The Soviet government declares that it does not pursue the aim of acquiring any part of Rumanian territory or of changing the existing social order in Rumania."

Several months later, by force of arms, the Soviet government imposed on Rumania—with a two-hour ultimatum—a communist-dominated government. Thus, against the will of the Rumanian people, Soviet Russia installed a communist regime that exists there to this day.

The Soviet government denies to anyone the right to annex territory by military action. But, Soviet Russia, at the end of World War II, annexed the Rumanian provinces of Bessarabia and Northern Bucovina (19,752 square miles and a population of 3.7 million), both provinces integral parts of Rumania.

For Soviet Russia to have the authority to make declarations such as that quoted from the address in the U.N. Assembly, a prime requisite would be that she, herself, be not guilty of the very acts her representatives call "international crimes" and, moreover, that she renounce the fruits of those aggressions committed—in violation of the principles she, herself, proclaims—against the independence and territorial integrity of other nations.

C. AUSTIN BARKER DISCUSSES GOLD CRISIS

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, those who consider Fort Knox a reservoir, and those who are concerned with our balance-of-payments problem will find enlightenment on the gold crisis in the very interesting talk given by C. Austin Barker, of the firm of Hornblower & Weeks-Hemphill, Noyes at the Pacific-Northwest Metals and Minerals Conference earlier this year.

The Commercial and Financial Chronicle printed it on June 8, and I appreciate the fact that my constituent, Joseph A. Gimma, brought it to my attention so that I in turn could present it to my colleagues.

Mr. Barker's "golden" discussion follows:

GOLD AS AN ECONOMIC FEVER THERMOMETER (By C. Austin Barker)

Our economy appears to be more sickly today than a year ago on an international payments basis and it has been getting sicker since 1957. Since 1960 when foreign central banks noted that our gold had become insufficient to cover short-term liabilities to all foreigners, our treasury gold has declined to about \$13.1 billion. The amount of gold set aside for the statutory reserve requirement of a 25% gold cover for Federal Reserve notes has risen somewhat since the commercial banks' cash deposit gold reserve requirement was abandoned in March 1965. The gold reserve requirement is now just a little under \$10 billion which leaves us about \$3 billion free gold. Meanwhile, as of last year-end, our short-term liabilities abroad had risen to over \$31 billion. Of this amount \$5.1 billion

was held by foreign international institutions, and of the balance, roughly, one-half was held by foreign central banks and the other one-half by foreign individuals.

Chart I [chart not printed in RECORD] shows the decline in U.S. gold stocks since 1949, the rise in short-term liabilities to foreigners and the current 25% statutory reserve requirement of gold to cover our national currency. It is interesting to note that two years ago the liquid U.S. dollar liabilities held by foreign central banks and governments totaled \$13.2 billion. At year-end 1966 these holdings had shrunk to \$12.6 billion, indicating that there is a definite measure of decline of confidence in the dollar by foreign central banks. The dip in the lower curve is the result of the removal of the gold cover for bank cash deposits with the Federal Reserve. The middle curve shows the run on gold that accompanied this policy debate and the Congressional legislation to effect it.

Chart II [chart not printed in RECORD] indicates that our exports of goods and services are growing rapidly and we have the largest trade and services surplus of any nation in the world, largely the result of American business efforts. Yet our spending abroad, largely by the Federal government, has created a perennial payments deficit with no end in sight. And our trade surplus has been deteriorating for several years because of rising costs and prices in our domestic economy due to the spending burden of foreign aid, military defense and our national budget deficit.

Based upon UN data on wholesale prices since World War II, the purchasing power of the Swiss franc has fallen far less than the U.S. dollar. In the past two years, the purchasing power of the Canadian dollar, French franc and German mark have bettered or equalled the U.S. dollar on this score and for a dozen years the Japanese yen has been the world's most stable major currency. The dollar's record is not a relatively enviable one on this basis.

It is clear that gold serves a role as a fever thermometer in that the rise or fall of gold stock indicates too heavy a payments surplus or too large a payments deficit. The basically simple remedy would be to prescribe easy or tight money, respectively. But there are also other national policies which affect foreign trade balances of goods and services payments deficits which can be examined as collateral remedies.

Despite the practice of many nations, it is still a fundamental economic truth that for the national economic body to remain healthy, it should practice good health habits in the form of sound fiscal and sound monetary policies domestically and internationally. The gold thermometer has already warned us repeatedly that something must be done about the balance of payments deficit. There is no sense in changing the scale on the thermometer because we would only be fooling ourselves. This is what some are advocating by a change in the bookkeeping for our international payments accounting. No government can control fundamental economic forces by legislation or changes in bookkeeping entries.

MONETARY REFORMS

There once was a Greek god named Proteus who, legend says, was a hard man to get hold of because when caught or cornered, he disengaged by simply changing shape. He reminds us of some monetary reformers. As soon as one argument or proposal is exposed or about to be exposed as unworkable in a worldly market place, a new reform shape shows up in the headlines. The sum total over the past decade is that a lot of people are confused or uncertain over what is a sound monetary policy. They are still a little wary of the "free lunch" idea but politicians and political administrators seem to be afraid to adopt standard, disciplined solutions and their inaction creates a fertile field for

scholars and government staffers who are emerging as supple innovators of "painless solutions." In the Protean tradition, escape is involved herein, rather than reform. As long as most countries felt there was no doubt that they could convert dollars into gold, U.S. dollars were considered a good supplement to their official gold reserves. This feeling lasted for many years. Now that there is doubt in those minds, some scholars and money managers and officials, primarily from England and the United States, are suggesting new monetary systems.

Some of these plans call for substituting a new kind of borrowing in place of borrowing from the International Monetary Fund because to avoid being paid back with depreciated currency, the IMF has in effect put gold clauses on their loans to avoid this possibility. The new borrowing plan is to give the creditors some sort of composite units which they would hold as a sort of "paper gold" but which would not be subject to conversion into gold. Naturally, all the creditor nations, those with favorable balances of international payments, are critical of these plans, and this is basically the description of most types of reform in international monetary systems in the debates now going on. Yet, as long as the U.S. Treasury and the Administration argue that gold revaluation is simply not in the cards and as long as we have some supply of gold in our Treasury stock, the arguments for non-gold "reform" will go on. If we lose our gold, other nations ultimately may take over the international banker's role and there will be no more "reform" debate.

Almost without exception, these "new" reforms include more government controls, immediately or inevitably. There is little consideration for the free market found in their structure. Some new propositions might even sacrifice our nation's monetary sovereignty. On this score, a United States citizen need not be cynical to be concerned. Many of the supporters of such risky solutions advocate monetary controls artificially to bring about "riskless" interest rates to "punish" the bankers and "reward" the poor. The resultant inflation, which is the cruelest tax of all, would then be checked by government price and profit controls, ceilings, or freezings. If business expansion and growth slow down, the reformers would be ready to have government step in and provide full employment by spending first, which is popular, and raising taxes later.

A popular answer to our concern is usually put in the form of a question, "Would you raise interest rates to solve the payments deficit and cause grave unemployment?"—or—"Are you not a Christian?" Many businessmen cringe at these questions. I suggest there are alternative solutions if we face the problem realistically.

WHAT ARE THE CHOICES?

In today's serious monetary situation we could first tighten money and credit by slowing down the purchase of government securities and by other Federal Reserve measures to prevent an outflow and also to correct the basic economy. However, the economy has already softened somewhat and the Federal Reserve is cooperating in this respect and creating new money to help avoid a recession. Under these conditions we can expect a gradual loss of gold and if it continues, possibly a run on gold.

A second step to solve the payments deficit would be to cut foreign aid temporarily until the Vietnam war is concluded and also to re-examine our policy of non-Vietnam military expenses abroad with a view to our allied nations sharing more of the burden or else we may have to reduce it unilaterally on the grounds that we simply cannot afford the foreign exchange burden. Europe has become stronger now and Russia is preoccupied on her eastern

borders. This decision could be made on a military rather than on a political basis. The armed services have traditionally supported a sound U.S. dollar as fundamental to our national security. "Who will be our friends when our gold is gone?" is a national defense as well as a political question.

A third choice is to raise the price of gold to, say, \$70 an ounce. This would be the most orderly of the alternatives because all countries would then do the same and there would be a status quo in this respect. The \$13 billion of U.S. gold would become \$26 billion and this would buy time for some of the above solutions to be worked out. In itself it would not solve the payments deficit but it would cut off the "crisis pressure."

The fourth alternate solution would be to stop selling gold at \$35 an ounce, or at any price. In effect, this would be a gold embargo. Other nations would then either close their "gold windows" or keep them open, but in either case the U.S. dollar would tend to depreciate in relation to other currencies as long as we have deficits. This would be an unstable and unsatisfactory situation and would require other nations to devalue irregularly or set up various counteracting forces in order to avoid an export advantage to America in its trading abroad. Presumably it would be immensely complicated by exchange controls and other controls which would handicap international free trade.

If we closed the "gold window" to foreigners the price of gold would rise because we would then have discontinued the policy of dumping gold on the market to hold it down to \$35 an ounce and the demand pressure for gold would increase relatively because of the uncertainties of a worldwide rise in gold prices. However, closing the gold window would slow but not stop the drain on our Treasury gold because U.S. industry buys gold from the Treasury at almost four times the annual U.S. gold mining production rate.

Thus if the gold embargo were continued for an indeterminate period, a fifth alternate remedy would need to be adopted then, or sooner, i.e., an exploration and/or production subsidy on gold for American miners. A subsidy was enacted to encourage uranium production and was very successful. The subsidy could be another "stop-gap" to "bide for time" but on a necessarily long-term approach to give American miners a chance at least to supply our industrial needs for gold.

RECENT GOLD PROPOSALS

On April 6th, the House Banking Committee of the U.S. Congress announced hearings on the legislation releasing some of the Treasury's silver stock from use as backing for silver certificates. The announcement came out about the same time as a disclosure by the U.S. Treasury that the stock of "free" silver had dwindled to less than 100 million ounces for the first time in decades. Only three years ago, it was widely believed that there was a many years' supply of silver in the Treasury's silver stock.

On the same date, April 6th, Mr. Rudolph A. Peterson, President of the Bank of America, in an address before the New York Chamber of Commerce, called for a reappraisal of the U.S. policy for combating the balance of payments deficit and for a relaxation of government controls over foreign lending and investing by American business. He stated that the U.S. piecemeal negative attempts to fix balance of payments problems have failed. And he called for a better understanding of the actual strength of the nation in world economic affairs. What we need, he proposed, is an overall long-range payments strategy which will be economically sound. He noted that the past U.S. approaches on the balance of payments deficit have resulted in short-term tactical moves

which have led us astray and caused anxiety abroad about the soundness of the dollar as well as the economic aims of the United States.

One cannot help but agree 100% with this leading banker and especially his desire for a timetable to roll back the pseudo-exchange controls now in existence, i.e., the interest equalization tax and the voluntary restraint program on bankers and corporations abroad. He is taking the strong, long-term forward view on this score and away from the tenets of mercantilism which we are in danger of having imposed upon us more and more. However, I am puzzled in one respect wherein it is stated that the increases in U.S. short-term liabilities abroad are measures of strength not weaknesses just as increases in deposit liabilities of commercial banks are one criterion of their strength. I understand why deposit liability increases are one criterion of strength for a commercial bank so long as the deposit monies are wisely and profitably invested which is the goal of commercial banking. This type of well-managed banking growth is what made the Bank of America the world's largest bank. Nevertheless, I cannot envisage a commercial bank asking its depositors not to withdraw their deposits because the bank would then be in difficulties (unless as a special plea for continuance as with some CD's). This appears to be the analogy of what the U.S. Treasury is doing by asking certain foreign nations not to cash in their claims for gold. Unfortunately, this cannot prevent a surreptitious liquidation by friendly nations of dollars for tangible U.S. goods.

We knew when the United States incurred short-term liabilities abroad that they could be turned into dollars at will and we had guaranteed that those dollars were convertible into gold at will. However, foreigners are not subject to restrictions about gold as U.S. citizens are. U.S. citizens cannot ask for payment in gold of domestic liabilities as, for example, for Federal Reserve notes. But if foreign central banks have accepted dollars as equivalent to gold, they have a choice later (which we do not have) of asking for final payment in gold. Moreover, in what did the U.S. invest the monies arising from these liabilities abroad? In foreign aid gifts or loans, a domestic deficit, or was it expensed abroad for military purposes? Thus, we have no counterpart claims or earnings as a bank has. It is for these reasons that I cannot see the commercial bank analogy in the case of our international short-term liabilities. We simply incur an interest burden when these liabilities grow. To be sure, if we could sell all of our foreign assets, short and long-term and pay off all short and long-term liabilities we would have a surplus of many billions of dollars, but we cannot plan so drastic or far-reaching a liquidation if we are to remain the world's banker and continue free international trading.

Mr. Peterson stated that as a last resort, if the drains on the U.S. gold stock became intolerable, the United States might have to refuse to sell gold. If the Administration can come up with an overall payments strategy which would be economically sound, as Mr. Peterson proposed, there would be no need for the drastic step of putting an embargo on our gold. On the other hand, I would suggest that if the Administration believes that we are going to reach this drastic requirement in the near future, perhaps it should raise the price of gold while we still have sufficient gold in our coffers, which, if doubled, could pay off a substantial part of the current U.S. liabilities abroad owed to central banks and would undoubtedly bring tremendous amounts of gold out of the hoards that investors have been holding as an inflation hedge. This gold undoubtedly would find its way into central bank official gold reserves and answer the gold liquidity problem. It is estimated by one international gold expert

that there is between \$20 and \$25 billion of gold locked up in private investors' hands. A price rise for gold would be a sounder action than the removal of the law requiring 25% in gold as a backing of the U.S. national paper currency. Removal of the 25% gold backing would free up nearly \$10 billion of our gold, all of the gold cover, and could cause a drastic run on gold. We all know what happened when Congress removed the small gold backing of commercial bank cash deposits with the Federal Reserve Bank. We lost \$1.5 billion of gold in a half year to "free up" \$4.7 billion of our gold reserves. The Treasury experts had estimated less than a \$400 million outflow of gold if we removed this "outer perimeter" of our gold protection. We can only conjecture the gold outflow if the 25% cover, the "inner perimeter," is breached, particularly with our payments deficit worsening and prospects of a rapidly increasing domestic budget deficit.

As an economist, recognizing the economic-fiscal impasse where the Administration and the Treasury refuse to revalue gold and have not been able to eliminate the deficit in gold drain, I cannot believe the Bank of America is strategically wrong in suggesting that the United States close the "gold window" under these given circumstances. It seems fruitless to tell the government, in effect, that its firmly reiterated policy is wrong. After all, they are our elected officials. Perhaps time will show them a better solution if they adopt a policy to stop selling gold to temporarily solve the emergency of losing our gold and then see the resultant effect on the dollar.

In my opinion, and I have no inside information, the proposal seems to be a very subtle and complicated approach with an educational purpose. Although it is not the best or most orderly solution, it could be turned into a better solution, later, after the price for its educational effect were paid. Thus it would be a step, though somewhat costly, toward order and better than butting one's head against the Treasury's well-publicized stone wall of \$35 an ounce and the continuing payments deficit.

I cannot pinpoint the cost of closing the "gold door" but the cost of our nation and to the world of losing all of our gold would be far, far greater in effect than the loss of the \$13.1 billion in U.S. Treasury stock. Congress has been spending billions of our dollars in foreign aid to the poorer nations for food and education and billions to fight poverty in our underdeveloped urban areas, including large amounts for education and retraining. The educational effect toward sounder fiscal and national policies in the United States that might be brought about by closing the gold door and noting the results might well be worth the cost. Therefore, I cannot criticize what I believe to be the well thought-out strategic approach to close the "gold window."

I also respect and support the admonitions of the vast majority of banks and most economists that the Administration adopt sound fiscal policies to solve our balance of payments deficit. But what is really to be done, now? Isn't this the overriding question for our national position as the world's international banker and the free world's freedom?

CONCLUSION

In an economy like ours which is geared to emphasize productivity and where politics is geared to popularity, pressures are created which tend to compromise financial and personal integrity. The social ills and fiscal irresponsibility are so much everybody's fault that they become nobody's fault. "Paper gold" solutions are not novel but horse-and-buggy innovations, out of place in a scientific age which needs financial integrity now more than at any other period in history. I could continue to catalog the fiscal-political problems but the big question for the Amer-

ican public remains, "Is the apparent insolubility of this conflict inevitable?" I say it is not inevitable if we guide our national body by diagnosing its economic health periodically with our gold fever thermometer and acting accordingly.

For centuries, gold has been the best money in the world, especially for international trade purposes. He who possesses gold may buy anything that is for sale. This is not always true of other currencies. It is less true of credit. That is why gold is the best hedge against a decline in the purchasing value of a country's currency, or conversely, the best known hedge against inflation where such factors are substantial enough to offset the cost of holding a non-earning asset. Over the past hundred years and more so in recent years, the world's leading international monetary experts have explained in books and treatises why gold is such an important and necessary element of any international monetary system under the economic policies of free international trade. Therefore I do not think it is necessary for me to try to explain why gold is so desirable or so useful for this purpose. Rather, it seems to me that all of the debates that have been going on for the past decade, and more intensely so in the past four or five years, have arisen because of the balance of payments deficits of the world's two key currency nations—the United States and Great Britain, and standard solutions are painful.

Since 1948 to the end of 1966, the gold holdings of all free nations rose from about \$33 billion in U.S. dollars to \$42 billion, or an increase of about 27%. World trade, on the other hand, measured by imports alone, more than tripled over that period. If we compare this with the free world gold production which has been rising gradually over the last dozen years and is now running at a little over \$1.4 billion a year and add the supplemental Soviet gold sales of \$300 million to \$400 million in the past years (except 1966), you will note that new supplies are not increasing at as rapid a rate as world trade. In recent years most of the new supplies seem to have disappeared into private hoards, because a look at the tables of official gold stocks discloses that they have risen very slightly since 1960 and not at all in 1966. Also, the gap between the two growth rates is largely made up by increased holdings of foreign currency reserves which are almost entirely in U.S. dollars. These inflationary increases were more than the total growth in the official gold stocks and have arisen primarily from the serious U.S. balance of payments deficits since 1948.

As to the arguments of those who cite current statistics on gold production figures to prove that there is not enough gold increase to supply increased liquidity for world trade, we should remind them that our present gold exchange standard is more flexible than the full gold standard, some say even too flexible. But it still serves as a fever thermometer and the reading is clear. If the United States adopts a realistic policy of equilibrium in its balance of payments and proves it, to the satisfaction of investors, worldwide, then gold should come out of hiding in sufficient quantity to solve the gold increase problem for a score or more years. And if this national policy is also followed by a rise in the price of gold to, say, a minimum of \$70 an ounce it is possible that new discoveries plus increased production in old gold mines ultimately should solve the problem of gold liquidity with respect to international trade requirements for at least a generation. Proteus can then return to Mount Olympus. I cannot speak for the next generation.

One needs to be a philosopher as well as an economist to try to understand the hopes and fears of humans in relation to gold and other forms of money and investors are human, even if some would classify them

into a lower order. If I were to adapt an ancient admonition to describe our monetary reformers it would become, "For the love of (control of) money is the root of all (inflationary) evil."

Some people say that if everyone stopped talking about the "gold problem," the problem would disappear. Longer term investors look at the operating facts and financial performance of a nation whose money they own, just as carefully as for a company whose securities they own. If, after investigation, the rumors and discussions turn out to be erroneous, the situation is disclosed in short order. The problem of gold and the U.S. payments deficit is not a sudden, speculative occurrence but has been going on for many years. Until the actual results of our nation's financial performance improves, the gold problem will be with us. It won't be cured by halting the talk or changing the payments accounting rules.

When human nature changes and every man shall work for and with his neighbors, we shall not need gold or any other form of money. Meanwhile, investors must find legal ways to protect their savings even though such self-defense is often criticized by some government officials and money managers.

NASA NEEDS A WATCHDOG

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News will be of interest to all Members of the House of Representatives. It pays a well deserved tribute to the work of my distinguished colleague, Congressman DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois, for his effective and thoughtful work as a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. His suggestions should be adopted if Congress is to fulfill its responsibility to the American people as the editorial writer points out.

His specific recommendation for an independent safety review board for the Space Agency has ample precedent. For some years the reactor development program of the Atomic Energy Commission has been monitored by an independent board of this type. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recently held extensive hearings on the manner in which this review board has functioned. I believe that it is the unanimous view of that committee that it is helpful to have the independent views and recommendations on safety by a group of experts who are not under any obligation to justify or defend administrative actions and decisions by those who are employed by the Government within the executive branch.

I hope the conference committee will heed the recommendations of our colleague, Congressman RUMSFELD.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, at this point I include the editorial referred to:

[From the Chicago Daily News, July 10, 1967]

NASA NEEDS A WATCHDOG

It will be interesting to see how Rep. Donald Rumsfeld (R-Ill.) fares in his fight

to preserve his House-approved safety amendments for the U.S. space program. He has pitted common sense against a formidable combination of space agency arrogance and contractors' vested interest. Both the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the big space contractors have strong influence in Congress. In such circumstances right doesn't always prevail.

Rumsfeld's proposals, airily rejected by NASA, would:

—Set up an independent safety review board to keep tabs on NASA operations and provide a double check for NASA in spotting dangers.

—Require NASA to keep the two congressional space committees fully informed and up to date on its operations.

There is ample justification for these requirements.

Part of it can be found in the scandalous record of fumbling, bumbling and pure carelessness unearthed in the investigation of the blazing death of three astronauts at Cape Kennedy last January. Most of the blame was directed at the prime Apollo contractor, North American Aviation Inc., but some of it had to be shared by NASA, with over-all responsibility for the project.

And part of the justification goes back to the condition President Eisenhower alluded to in his famous farewell speech: the perils of an alliance between big government and the big industries that serve it and profit by its contracts.

Congress, the branch of government in closest touch with the people, has a unique obligation to exert discipline over the executive department's workings. In exotic fields like those of the Central Intelligence Agency and NASA there is an understandable tendency to resent such surveillance. But those same agencies, for all the high average caliber of their work, have demonstrated that when supervision is lacking both arrogance and carelessness flourish.

Rumsfeld is serving the public interest in trying to bring NASA to some kind of accounting.

The bill is before a conference committee that begins consideration this week. NASA succeeded in keeping Rumsfeld-type provisions out of the Senate bill, and Rumsfeld, himself, while a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, was not named to the joint House-Senate committee. There is obviously good reason to fear that, unless public concern is expressed, NASA will quietly work its way on the measure and keep the public's nose out of its "private" affairs.

A LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I have become more and more concerned about our present policy in Vietnam, specifically why we are not doing more to halt the flow of supplies to North Vietnam. For the information and consideration of my colleagues, I quote the following portions of a letter received from an officer serving aboard a ship in the Western Pacific:

For sometime I have meant to write you on a subject, one which both infuriates me and gives me a sense of deep impotence—the continuous stream of Russian and Soviet bloc ships which we sight daily, indeed hourly, in

the Gulf of Tonkin, generally with laden hulls on a northerly course, or riding high heading towards the southeast. As CIC Officer, I am often able to listen in over the radio nets to the many contact reports filed on these Soviet ships, and it is continually paradoxical to me to then read in the next issue of *Stars and Stripes*, *Time*, or *Newsweek*, that some administration official is pledging all efforts to fight this war and bring our men home quickly and safely. And yet, still these ships steam steadily on, unperturbed by political bombast, carrying the materiel to kill American troops.

For one doesn't have to be too perceptive to understand what is being carried in those hulls, or where they are going. While our carrier based planes are bombing the scattered oil, munition and supply depots and lines of communication in North Vietnam, with our pilots risking their lives over murderous barrages of anti-aircraft weapons, the Soviets are shipping in a flood of war supplies to their North Vietnamese and Viet Cong allies, allowing them to maintain their aggression against South Vietnam. I have the terrible feeling that political expediency and indecision as to the goals of this war are forcing our pilots to lose their lives bombing dispersed targets, when the one stroke of closing Haiphong Harbor and its associated smaller ports could eliminate the necessity for many of these costly strikes over North Vietnam.

It is generally acknowledged that a large portion of the munitions the North Vietnamese need to fight the war are coming in by sea. Were we to use our Navy to control the seas (as we have the capacity so easily to do), we could remove a major Communist supply link to Vietnam and deal a crippling blow to the ambitions of Ho Chi Minh.

I do not pretend to be an expert in the ways of world power politics, nor do I know what effect this further "escalation" of the war might have, but I do know what effect our failure to interdict Communist supply lines, to more effectively fight this war, is having.

I have only to pick up a copy of the UNC Alumni News to see that already several of my classmates—and friends—have died in Vietnam, and to note that a substantial number of the men from the classes preceding mine have died fighting over here. I have only to go down a list of former shipmates who volunteered for duty in Vietnam to pick out a name here, a name there, of men who have been killed in the past year. Both you and I know that more will die in the months ahead.

It is tragic to be killed in any war, even a just war, but it must be of some consolation to the parents and wives of these men, and the men themselves, to know that they are dying for a cause toward which every effort is being made to win, and in which their sacrifice meant something; it is unforgivable to be killed in a war that our leaders have not the strength to pursue to victory, but are content only to yearn for a dubious stalemate of questionable honor.

I know that you will consider my remarks, sir, and I hope that if you agree with them, you will be able to act in the future to lead America toward a more constructive policy for victory in Vietnam. Only American victory will provide that elusive peace we all seek.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A U.S. WORLD FOOD STUDY AND COORDINATING COMMISSION

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I enthusiastically join those colleagues who have, with great imagination and foresight, called for a joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission.

By cosponsoring this resolution for an 18-member, bipartisan group to study world food problems and what can be done about them, I wish to call to the attention of the House the two major problems which this all-important initiative is intended to deal with—

First, the world problem of food supply and demand brought about by a universal population explosion.

Second, the decline in American agriculture resulting from steadily increasing production costs and farm debts.

Experts tell us, Mr. Speaker, that by 1980—only 13 years away—there will be five times more people to feed throughout the world than are now being fed. Imagine for a moment what this increased demand for food would mean, for example, to famine-ravished India and to the truly underdeveloped and war-torn countries of the world.

Where is this food? Where will it come from? What is the answer? Undoubtedly responsibility for meeting such a crisis will eventually rest with the rich countries—those who presently can sustain themselves—and principally to the United States. But I contend that, unless we plan and act now, neither we nor any other country acting alone or in concert with others will be up to the task of feeding a starving world.

I am not saying that the United States can or should solve or even attempt to solve the world's food problems. On the contrary, passage of this resolution might well avert such a possibility. In any event, however, we cannot ignore our basic responsibility to humanity should this awesome prospect become reality and there seems to be little doubt that the handwriting is on the wall.

The thought of a major world famine—widespread starvation—people dying like flies in the streets and in their homes from hunger and malnutrition—is a disturbing one indeed. More disturbing than that, moreover, is the added thought of a world unable to respond to more than 100 countries pleading and begging for food at our doorstep. Such a situation conjures up in my mind conditions as gruesome as nuclear holocaust in terms of panic and frustration.

I have always maintained, Mr. Speaker, that in the final analysis, the world will choose between communism and freedom, not as a result of war or conquest, but on the merits of what these two systems can offer people everywhere for the greater uplift of mankind. Historically, the Communists have been long on promises but short on delivery and I need only cite the recent Middle East struggle as an example. To meet this serious food challenge of the future, I submit that the forces of freedom—under our leadership—had better get their heads out of the sand to meet this impending international crisis.

We can best approach this objective by being alert for every opportunity to use our great productive capacity as a major weapon in a stronger economic offensive. Hungry people throughout the world are looking to America for guidance in agricultural policy—we must unleash the creative and productive genius of American agriculture. This has the potential of being one of our greatest weapons as we seek victory in the cold war.

Second, Mr. Speaker, is the promise this entire prospect of a subsequent world food shortage holds for the American farmer and our agricultural experts—both from a short-range and a long-range viewpoint. Now is the time for us to plan to avoid these future shortages.

As far back as 1964, I pointed out that there was a dangerous trend in our slumping agricultural economy that had to be reversed. In that speech, I specifically stated:

The American farmer has always been known as the "Backbone of this Nation" but improper Federal agriculture and fiscal policies have been "chipping away" at his ability to maintain his independence and self-sufficiency. Without equivocation, I stand ready to work for a reversal of this dangerous trend.

When one considers these and other problems, in the light of the present farm slump in which we find ourselves, grave doubts arise about our ability to feed ourselves 13 years hence—much less any other countries.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we return to the premise on which we began. What is the answer? Unfortunately, there are no readymade solutions which have already been conceived. A beginning, however, is to be found in the preamble to the joint resolution which I offer today and I quote:

To establish a United States World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present United States efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of United States agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends.

In summary and in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it has been said and I repeat here today that the world is rapidly losing the race between an adequate food supply and a growing population. At the same time, the American farmer is fast losing out as his production costs and farm debt hit record highs.

We must, in my judgment, act now by getting the best minds together to study and evaluate the problem and to make constructive, realistic recommendations for meeting this awesome prospect of the future.

I urge the immediate establishment of a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission in accordance with the provisions of the joint resolution which I offer here today.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in

the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I again place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD information pertaining to the Redwood National Park matter now pending before the House Interior Committee.

Specifically, I will insert my testimony made before the committee on June 27, 1967.

With the proposed park to be located in my congressional district, I hope my colleagues will benefit from the points I make. It will be my intent to do everything possible to keep my friends in the Congress posted on the progress of this important and complicated conservation measure.

Therefore, I include my statement at this point in the RECORD:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members, for the opportunity to appear on this legislation to create a Redwood National Park on the North Coast of California. It has been aptly labeled the most important conservation legislation before the Congress, and I concur. Besides the need to create a National Park to give suitable recognition to the coast redwood giants, unemployment in several of the counties in the redwood area has been running at levels up and beyond 15% of the labor force. The economic stimulus offered by a major tourist attraction would be of great help to this area, *providing it doesn't undercut the economic base we already have.*

Today, I expect to take very little of your time. As Congressman from the redwood area, I have presented a plan which I call "Redwoods-to-the-Sea". This conservation package includes a Redwood National Park and Seashore of 53,000 acres in the north as well as two other major units—creation of the 31,500 acre Kings Range Conservation Area near the center of my district and completion of the 53,000 acre Point Reyes National Seashore at the Southern end of my district. This is a regional plan calculated to achieve a balanced development according to priority.

I have done this to encourage legislative action on these three units because of their importance to the future of the area. The Committee and the Congress have an obligation to the Nation's taxpayers to tell the entire story—what is planned in the way of conservation projects and what it will cost.

Too often, there is a tendency on Federal projects to not tell the whole story—yet the projects are authorized—and then watch the costs escalate to astronomical figures.

As Members of Congress, we have a dual responsibility. We must represent the conservation organizations advocating these projects, but we must also represent the people affected and in particular, the taxpayer who must inevitably pay the price.

They are entitled to know the exact costs involved. Further, the people affected must be relieved as soon as possible.

They have been living in a kind of economic hell, under the threat of government action, waiting for these projects to be completed.

I cannot over-emphasize the vital need to take the necessary legislative action to complete the Redwoods-to-the-Sea conservation proposal.

The people of the Redwood Empire will continue to be harassed and restricted until the boundaries of these three important conservation units are established.

No one can make definite plans until the

necessary Federal legislative action is complete.

The area is in a depressed condition now because of the uncertainties previously mentioned.

I believe all of you have copies of this map and brochure. With the Committee's permission, I will submit these copies to the Committee for its files.

Rather than go into detail on Redwoods-to-the-Sea at this point, I would like to submit for the record, a copy of a speech I gave before the National Wildlife Federation in San Francisco, and then make one observation. This plan contains a Redwood National Park and Seashore proposal on which, right now, there is substantial agreement. Further, it contains language granting the Secretary of the Interior expanded authority so that the boundaries on this map can be expanded, *providing further agreement is reached.* In other words, I have proposed a compromise that would create an outstanding Redwood National Park and Seashore in its present form and can be expanded to include additional new redwoods and further fruits of compromise through negotiations between the Federal and State governments and private owners. In my judgment, this is the only way you will get a Redwood National Park worthy of the name.

With that brief and general explanation, Mr. Chairman, I will rest my case for today. I believe I may be of much greater service to this Committee in its orderly consideration of the Redwood issue if I yield to other witnesses. Later, when the Committee has isolated the specific problems in creation of a Redwood National Park, and has held field hearings and trips into the area, I will make myself available for any questions or detail work the Committee may desire. As a pilot who has flown the area between San Francisco and the Oregon line nearly 1,000 times, as a native of the area and as a representative of the people in local government and the Congress for nearly 12 years, I feel that I can be of assistance.

Before I close, however, I would like to review very briefly the three major problems involved in creation of a redwood national park in this area, mainly for the purpose of focusing your attention on them early in the hearings. These problems are: (1) Federal acquisition of State park lands to be included in the national park; (2) acquisition of private lands; and (3) the cost.

Regarding the first, I want to congratulate the State of California and the Federal Administration for their diligent efforts to reach agreement on an exchange of Federal lands for the State Redwood Parks. My mail and a number of news stories have indicated an impression that we were undergoing a moratorium on the Redwood issue. Such is not the case. I am well aware of the continued efforts by the State and Federal administrations to reach agreement on acquisition of State Redwood Park lands for a national park. It is my understanding that general agreement has been reached, and I am anxious to hear the testimony of Interior's witnesses on this point.

Regarding the acquisition of private lands, however, I am sorry to report that no such activity has taken place. This is the area affecting local tax base, hundreds of jobs and the economy of the entire area. To my knowledge at this time, I have not learned of any progress or initiative by the Federal agencies in land exchange negotiations between the Federal government and the private land owners involved.

This seems to be a key to future success. If new redwoods are to be added to park lands, the Federal government should be developing a prospectus and the proper forum for entering into negotiations with the private owners.

It is for this reason that I have included Title III in my bill.

The key words to success in establishing a Redwood National Park are "compromise", "negotiations" and "exchange".

There is probably no precedent for some of this, but we've said all along that the Redwood Park "question" is unique and will require different approaches to solutions than any other conservation or park proposal—if you're going to have a worthwhile Redwood National Park.

One final point—the Federal cost to create this park. The Sierra Club's proposal has been estimated at between \$120 million and \$250 million, depending on the estimator. The Administration's proposal has been estimated by them at \$60 million, and I understand this has now been refined to a figure near \$100 million. As we all know, Mr. Chairman, cost can be a mortally wounding factor to the proposals for a Redwood National Park. In a year when the Congress temporarily refused to increase the debt limit, when all of us are concerned about government expenditures, closest scrutiny will be given to any park proposal that costs \$100 million or \$60 million. Only by broad use of exchanges can we create an excellent park at minimal cost, as my bill provides.

I believe this Committee and the Congress has an opportunity to establish a benchmark for future land-use policy that will be extremely beneficial to all Americans as they consider this Redwood Park question.

But in so doing, we must recognize the fact that there are two schools of conservation thought—preservation conservation and wise multiple-use conservation—giving balanced consideration to both.

If you adopt the Redwoods-to-the-Sea concept, tie down the respective boundaries once and for all—you will properly set the stage for a National land-use policy that will greatly enhance the potential for economic growth.

This, in effect, would establish a land-use pattern in the Redwood Empire of California that could be adopted elsewhere.

NEW YORK'S LUCK RUNNING OUT ON LOTTERY SCHEME?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this body takes up H.R. 10595, a bill which would prohibit federally insured financial institutions from taking part in lotteries. It is imperative that this legislation be enacted so that banks can immediately be disassociated from the lottery scheme in New York, and to free the banks from any adverse reaction from the public which could result from the lottery. This morning's New York Times reports that the New York State lottery, which had previously been reaching only 50 percent of its ticket sale estimates, has now dropped to 25 percent of its goal.

When the lottery was first conceived, it was estimated that 1 million tickets would be sold a day. However, during the first month of the lottery, only 7 million tickets were sold, and indications are that sales will drop even more in the coming months.

Typical of the reaction by the public to the New York State lottery was the remark by an upstate New York bank

official, whose region had been allotted 1.2 million tickets and had sold a little more than 100,000 tickets.

"Do you know anybody that can use a million unused tickets?" he said in the Times' article. "Maybe we can have one hell of a bonfire."

[From the New York Times, July 11, 1967]

BANK FIGURES SHOW STATE LOTTERY SALES

ONLY 25 PERCENT OF GOAL

(By Sydney H. Schanberg)

Nearly complete returns, from the first month of the New York State lottery indicate that sales were only about one-quarter of what the state had predicted.

A survey of the nine regional banks for the lottery showed yesterday that about seven million, or possibly less, of the \$1 tickets were sold in June. The state had predicted a sale of \$30-million a month, or \$360-million a year, and had based its 1967-68 school-aid budget on this forecast. All profits from the lottery are to go for education.

The biggest loser, if the lottery continues to falter, will be New York City, which is supposed to receive \$72-million extra in state school aid from the lottery.

The lottery's failure to live up to expectations could thus push both the city and the state closer to seeking tax increases next year—a year when all state legislators are up for re-election and therefore very reluctant to pass any new taxes.

The State Tax Department, which is running the lottery, refused to discuss the sales results yesterday, except to acknowledge that they were "off."

Tax Commissioner Joseph H. Murphy contended that the figures received so far from the regional banks were incomplete and possibly misleading. He said he would make public "the final audited figures" as soon as they were available, possibly early next week.

Officials at almost all the regional banks, however, said the figures they gave out yesterday were either final or close to final, with perhaps a handful of lottery outlets still to trickle in.

The tickets are being sold in about 4,000 banks, hotels and motels around the state; they are also available at a few local government offices and at the harness-racing tracks.

The regional bank for New York City, the Chemical Bank New York Trust Company, declined to release the sales figures for the city, saying that it was up to the Tax Department to make them public, if it chose to. However, sources elsewhere reported that city sales were in the area of 4.5 million.

New York City is the key to the lottery's success or failure; when the state issued its forecast of 30 million tickets a month, it estimated that about 60 per cent of them, or 18 million, would be sold in the city.

The eight regional banks covering the rest of the state reported total sales of about 2.2 million tickets.

One upstate bank official, who asked to remain unidentified, noted that his region had been allotted 1.2 million tickets and had sold only slightly over 100,000. "Do you know anybody that can use a million unused tickets?" he said. "Maybe we can have one hell of a bonfire."

One apparent reason for the lottery's poor performance is the lack of a vigorous advertising campaign. Because of Federal laws that keep lottery advertising off the air and out of magazines and most newspapers, the state is limited generally to highway billboards and posters in buses, subways, commuter railroad stations and the outlets themselves.

LAST MINUTE ADS TAKEN

"There's no question," Commissioner Murphy said recently, "that our promotional efforts are so severely restricted that it's very difficult to get the word around."

The Tax Department allotted \$1.5-million to its billboard and advertising campaign. Also, in a last-minute attempt to boost the lagging sales, it took several ads in a few Albany and New York City newspapers during the last week of June. Because of the Federal laws, the ads could run only in the editions that were not put in the mails.

The lottery's slump will have no effect on the size of the monthly prizes. There will still be 240 prizes for every million tickets sold, ranging from \$150 up to \$100,000. A yearly superprize of \$250,000 will also be awarded at the end of the state fiscal year, March 31.

The first monthly drawing will be held in three stages, starting in Albany on July 20 and ending in New York City on July 24 and July 26. The pattern for all the monthly lotteries is expected to be the same, with the prize-drawing for the July lottery, for example to be held sometime in late August.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House concurrent resolution, identical to the one sponsored by a number of our colleagues, expressing the sense and will of Congress that the Government of the United States maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal and that the administration in no way forfeit, cede, negotiate, or transfer any of these sovereign rights or jurisdiction to any other sovereign nation or international organization.

Along with a number of my colleagues I am deeply distressed and disturbed at the recent reports that the administration has entered into a proposed treaty with Panama that would surrender U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone. While the House has no part in the ratification of treaties, we do have a responsibility to all of the people of the United States to safeguard their interests.

Theodore Roosevelt wrote in December 1918:

The Panama Canal must not be internationalized. It is our canal; we built it; we fortified it, and we will protect it, and we will not permit our enemies to use it in war. In time of peace, all nations shall use it alike, but in time of war our interests at once become dominant.

These words are just as applicable today. The United States cannot discharge its responsibilities for the Panama Canal with less control and jurisdiction than that to which it is entitled under the 1903 treaty. The Panama Canal is no ordinary enterprise but a vast economic and strategic agency that can in nowise serve two masters or operate under divided authority. Over 70 percent of the Canal Zone traffic either originates or terminates in U.S. ports.

The Panama Canal has a major strategic importance to the United States—politically throughout the Caribbean and Latin America, and economically to U.S.

commerce. The United States has to make certain that freedom of transit between the Atlantic and the Pacific exists for everybody. What would happen under this proposed treaty if a Nasser should become President of Panama?

It should seem clear that this proposed treaty is not in the best interests of either the United States or Panama. It will only further the ambitions of a few Panamanian politicians who have used the canal for all these years as a campaign issue to cover up the real problems of their country. Rather than solve any problems, the proposed treaty would give rise to more and very serious problems. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join in expressing the will of Congress that it is for maintenance and preservation of U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction in the strategically important Panama Canal.

FARMERS SUFFER FROM PRICE-DEPRESSING IMPORTS

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, once again I must call to the attention of the House the fact that another segment of the American farm community is suffering great damage because of the rising flood of price-depressing imports from abroad.

Many mink farmers—including those in my 38th Congressional District of New York—will be forced to abandon their industry unless the flow of mink pelts into the United States is limited.

I have today introduced legislation that would place a yearly quota on the imports of mink pelts that compete with domestic producers. The rate that these pelts are being imported is an alarming statistic. It is driving down the market price for American mink farmers. Last year 5.7 million pelts were imported and the average monthly rate so far this year is higher than the last.

The mink farmers in my congressional district are suffering great damage from the effects of this competition. My bill would insure that the markets would not be lost to our domestic mink farmers.

Under my bill a quota based on domestic consumption would be placed on imports of whole skins, whether or not dressed, with a duty of 50 percent ad valorem on mink imports in excess of the quota.

DR. JOHN G. SUGG, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 1, Dr. John G. Sugg, an optometrist from Fayetteville, Ark., assumed the leadership of organized professional optometry in the United States upon his elevation to the presidency of the American Optometric Association.

Dr. Sugg is a native of the State, having been born in Gentry, Ark., in 1922. He was graduated from high school there in 1940, after which he took three semesters of work at John Brown University in Siloam Springs, Ark., and attended the Junior College at Poteau, Okla. Following 3 years in the Navy during World War II, he enrolled in Northern Illinois College of Optometry. Following his graduation there, he established his first practice in Siloam Springs in 1950. He moved the practice to its present location in Fayetteville in 1954, and has conscientiously served his patients and his community.

Dr. Sugg has been president of the Fayetteville Junior Chamber of Commerce and president of the Rotary Club, and served a term on the Jaycees' national board of directors. He is a recipient of the Jaycees' Distinguished Service Award.

This gentleman also has served his profession in an exemplary manner, as chairman of important State association committees, president of the Arkansas Optometric Association, and in the organization of which he is now president. He was director of the department of public information of the American Optometric Association for 3 years; was elected to the AOA board of trustees in 1962, where he served as trustee for the department of optometric practice during his first 2 years on the board. He was elected vice president in 1965, and was trustee for external agencies and liaison trustee for the International Association of Boards of Examiners in Optometry during that year.

Dr. John Sugg accepted further responsibilities to his more than 14,000 colleagues in the AOA when he was designated president-elect at the annual meeting in 1966. In that capacity he functioned as trustee for the association's ad hoc committees.

His other professional affiliations include membership in the American Optometric Foundation and the optometric extension program. He is also a fellow in the American Academy of Optometry.

Arkansas is proud of this native son and father of four, who has attained the highest position which can be conferred by his fellow professionals. We wish him well in his year at the helm of this great organization, the American Optometric Association, which is devoted to provision of the best possible visual care of the American people.

DESPERATE NEEDS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FUNDING

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, during the Fourth of July congressional recess, I toured my congressional district each and every day, talking to people, discussing local problems with various groups, speaking, and attending meetings. Other than Vietnam, perhaps the greatest concern throughout my district was for the full funding of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. My State has a good record in this field, yet much remains to be done and is being undertaken. But the State cannot do it alone. Upon my return to Washington, I found waiting for me a most eloquent plea for full funding from Kenneth H. Spies, the chief engineer of our State sanitary authority. The text of the letter will be of interest to my colleagues because it so graphically describes the problems of a State that is making a huge effort to help itself. When we are discussing \$5 billion for the space program, and huge sums for highway beautification, foreign aid, and for the administrative costs of the poverty program, we must attempt to assign priorities with needs like this in mind.

The letter referred to follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
OREGON STATE SANITARY AUTHORITY,
Portland, Oreg., July 7, 1967.

Re Federal grants for sewage treatment works construction.

HON. WENDELL WYATT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WYATT: For the past ten years the federal grant programs authorized by PL 84-660 for assisting local communities in the financing of sewage treatment works construction has been of considerable help in the state of Oregon. Now, however, unless Congress substantially increases the appropriation for fiscal year 1968, this federal grant program may be responsible for delaying for an extended period of time the construction of many urgently needed sewage treatment projects in Oregon.

Under amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act approved by Congress in 1966, a maximum appropriation of \$450,000,000 for construction grants for fiscal year 1968 is authorized. Of this amount, Oregon's share would be \$4,695,050. The President's budget, however, calls for an appropriation of only \$200,000,000, of which Oregon is to receive \$2,262,550. This will be woefully inadequate to meet the requests made by our communities.

We have just completed our compilation of the applications that we have received for fiscal year 1968 for federal grants under PL 84-660, and for state grants under the bill passed recently by the 1967 Oregon Legislature. These applications which cover 49 projects request a total of \$14,324,788 in federal funds and \$7,461,738 in state funds.

Enclosed for your information is a summary of Oregon's present sewage treatment works grant requirements. From it you will note that we have 7 projects that received 30% grant offers from the 1967 FY appropriation, but because they did not get under construction before July 1, 1967, they are now eligible for an increased federal grant equal to 50%, and in some cases to 55%, of the total project cost. The increases in these 7 grants amount to \$833,533 which must come from the 1968 federal appropriation.

In addition, there were 2 other projects that were approved for federal grants in FY 1967, but they did not receive grant offers because of insufficient federal funds. These 2 projects will require \$1,129,500 from the 1968 federal allotment. A third project (North Umpqua Sanitary District) was not approved for a grant offer in FY 1967, but its construction was started during that fiscal year and under the 1966 amendments passed by Congress it is now eligible for a 33% federal grant.

These 10 projects, which were either started or intended to be started last fiscal year, will therefore require \$2,032,278 from Oregon's 1968 allotment of only \$2,262,550. This leaves only \$230,272 to apply toward the 39 new projects which are eligible for at least \$12,292,510 in federal grants.

Even if Congress appropriates the maximum amounts authorized for the next two years (\$450,000,000 in 1968 and \$700,000,000 in 1969), Oregon's allotment will not be enough to fill these requests because it will total only \$11,822,600.

In response to the demands of Congress and in order to do their share in abating the pollution of the nation's public waters, the Oregon communities have greatly accelerated their programs for construction of sewage treatment works. The Oregon State Sanitary Authority recently adopted water quality standards and an implementation and enforcement plan in order to comply with requirements of the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965. This plan calls for secondary treatment of all sewage wastes throughout the State within a five year period. It is hoped that these programs will not have to be delayed awaiting the receipt of federal grants. Any assistance you can give us in this matter will be sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

KENNETH H. SPIES,
Secretary and Chief Engineer.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the great esteem in which John Quincy Adams is held by his countrymen is shown by such things as the recent visit to the Adams National Historic Site made by Mrs. Johnson, the First Lady, and by the fact that the late President Kennedy opened his book, "Profiles in Courage," with an account of how this great American statesman willingly risked his public career by submerging both personal and regional interests to the national good. I have expressed my own regard for the tradition of public service of the Adams family by introducing a bill which would enlarge the Adams National Historic Site.

Today, July 11, we observe the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams. He was born in 1767 in the North Parish of Braintree, Mass., the son of John and Abigail Adams.

Among his earliest memories were the sights of warfare and revolutionary struggle. With his mother he watched the British attack upon Bunker Hill. During his long life he took pride in the accomplishments of the Revolution and knew his greatest satisfaction in observing the growth and achievements of the American Republic.

In February of 1778, at the age of 11, he accompanied his father on a brief

diplomatic mission to France. In June 1779, they left on a second mission to Europe, the negotiation of a treaty of peace with Great Britain. On this voyage, young John Quincy Adams began the diary which he continued with minor interruptions until a few years before his death in 1848. Prof. Samuel Flagg Bemis has said of this diary that it is "the greatest personal record ever set down by anyone in the United States."

In it are described the men and events of the early years of our beloved country as seen by one of America's finest statesmen. Only the high points can be mentioned in the brief sketch of his distinguished career that I can offer on this occasion.

He was graduated from Harvard College in 1787 and then studied law for 3 years in the Newburyport office of a lawyer who later became chief justice of Massachusetts. Adams then practiced law, wrote politically controversial newspaper articles, and in 1794 was appointed the American representative to the Netherlands. He served in a similar post in Berlin. In 1801 he resumed his law practice in Boston.

In 1802 he was elected to the Massachusetts Senate. In February of 1803 he was elected a U.S. Senator by the Great and General Court of the Commonwealth. In many of the stands that he took as a U.S. Senator he earned the wrath of the Federalist Party, and his Senate career came to an end in 1808. He had previously been appointed Boylston professor of rhetoric and oratory at Harvard, where he now concentrated all his energy and ability. Despite his disagreements with the Federalists, he was not a Republican. Neither did he fully support the Republican administration, and he refused a Republican offer of a congressional nomination. Suffering the fate of many independents of that period and of later ones, he was regarded with suspicion by both parties.

When James Madison became President of the United States, he appointed Adams the American representative at the Russian court. Adams participated in the peace negotiations with Britain after the War of 1812, and was then appointed American Ambassador to Great Britain, serving in a post his famous father had once occupied with great distinction.

In 1817 he was invited by President Monroe to serve as Secretary of State. The most important negotiation conducted by Adams in this important Cabinet post was the treaty for the cession of Florida by Spain to the United States. While the Spanish treaty was in the making, Missouri applied for statehood and a struggle arose on the issue of the exclusion of slavery. Adams approved of the Missouri Compromise. He believed that the measure excluded slavery in territories and States formed in the area north of the dividing line. He saw clearly that the principle involved in the Missouri Compromise had momentous possibilities that might even lead to the dissolution of the Union. To him the controversy over Missouri was the "title-page to a great tragic volume." His opposition to slavery was strong, and in

his diary he noted that a life devoted to the problem of emancipation would be one "nobly spent or sacrificed." In foreign affairs, the Monroe Doctrine, enunciated by President Monroe on December 2, 1823, owed much to the influence of Adams as Secretary of State.

As the presidential election of 1824 approached, Adams was one of four candidates. The office of Secretary of State which he occupied had by custom come to be regarded as a steppingstone to the Presidency. During his term as Secretary, however, Adams had done very little in practical ways to advance his prospects. When the returns were in, Jackson had received 99 votes. Adams 84, Crawford 41, and Clay 37. Support for Adams had come from New York and the New England States. With Crawford seriously ill, the decision in the House of Representatives rested with the supporters of Clay. Clay's dislike of Jackson made him support Adams. Adams received the votes of 13 States to Jackson's seven.

In his inaugural address, Adams stated a broad plan of internal improvements for the country. In his annual messages, he set forth his ideas for directing the powers of the Federal Government toward improving arts and sciences, and for establishing a national university, astronomical observatories, and other enterprises and activities designed to improve the general welfare.

Opposition took shape in Congress. A majority of those elected to Congress in the middle of his presidential term were opposed to Adams. In the bitter presidential election of 1828 he was defeated by Jackson. He returned to Massachusetts where he expected to remain in retirement in Quincy. The people of the Plymouth congressional district had other plans for him, however, and he was elected as their Representative to the 22d Congress by a large majority. He was reelected for eight successive Congresses, serving for 17 years less 10 days. Neither before nor since has a Member sat in the House of Representatives who possessed so rich and varied an experience as he did. He was a former President who had an insider's knowledge of the political history of 40 years both at home and abroad.

He was industrious and conscientious in discharging his duties as a Member of the House of Representatives. He served on many important committees and prepared reports which covered a great number of the issues of public policy of his time. As a debater he was listened to with respect and sometimes with fear. His integrity was unquestioned, his information was vast and ready, and his manner of speech was direct, forceful, and sometimes caustic.

On September 17, 1842, Adams gave to his constituents a full statement of his conduct during his service in the House of Representatives in the form of a study of the administrations of the successive Presidents of the period. It was called "An Address of John Quincy Adams to His Constituents of the 12th Congressional District." He described his conception of what the South and the slave power had done and had wished to do,

and the extent to which their policies had been aided by a sacrifice of principle by the North. It was the last political document of importance prepared by Adams, and vividly recapitulated 12 years of American politics at the national level as seen by a leading participant.

On November 19, 1846, he was stricken with paralysis while walking in Boston, but recovered enough to take his seat in the House on February 16, 1847. One year later, on February 21, 1848, just after he had responded to the call of his name in the House Chamber, he suffered a second stroke. He was carried to the Speaker's room in the Capitol, and died there on the evening of February 23.

The next day, the Speaker officially announced to the assembled House Members the death of their venerated fellow Member. Eulogies followed, and the Members of the House unanimously agreed that a committee of one Member from each State and territory of the Union should be appointed to escort the remains of their esteemed colleague, the Honorable John Quincy Adams, to the place designated by his friends for his interment. Thomas Hart Benton said of him in the Senate:

Wherever his presence could give aid and countenance to what was useful and honorable to man, there he was. Where could death have found him but at the post of duty?

The funeral ceremonies in Washington and elsewhere assumed the proportions and significance of a national pageant. Thousands filed past his coffin as it lay in a committee room of the House of Representatives. On Saturday, February 26, from sunrise to noon, cannons were fired in salute to the departed statesman. At 10 minutes before noon, the Speaker called the House of Representatives to order. The President of the United States entered and took his place at the right hand of the Speaker. Then came the Justices of the Supreme Court, senior officers of the Army and Navy in full uniform, the diplomatic corps in formal attire, all taking their seats in order right and left of the aisle in front of the rostrum. The Senate followed, the Vice President taking his place at the Speaker's left. Finally, the son of the deceased, Charles Francis Adams, other members of the family, and close friends came in and seated themselves in a row reserved for them. Then, after a prayer, entered Senators Webster and Davis of Massachusetts, preceding the coffin.

On a catafalque in the space directly in front of the Speaker rested the mortal remains of John Quincy Adams. The silver-mounted coffin bore a plate with an inscription that had been written, at the request of the Massachusetts delegation, by Daniel Webster. It read:

John Quincy Adams, born an inhabitant of Massachusetts, July 11, 1767, died a citizen of the United States, in the Capitol, at Washington, February 23, 1848, having served his country for half a century, and enjoyed its highest honors.

The Chaplain of the House preached a funeral sermon. A choir sang a closing hymn, and the cortege moved out of the Capitol through the east front, joining a

civic funeral procession which had been formed at the portico.

Not since the city of Philadelphia had paid similar homage to its beloved Benjamin Franklin had there been such public testimony to a deceased American statesman. The funeral procession that honored John Quincy Adams reflected the nature of his 60 years of public service, years that extended from the American Revolution to the end of the Mexican War. Slowly the procession moved out of the Capitol Grounds on its way to the Congressional Cemetery to which Adams in his lifetime had accompanied so many of his friends and colleagues.

First marched the military companies of Washington with a funeral band. Many times had Adams reviewed them in the District of Columbia.

Then came the Chaplains of the House and Senate, and the clergy of the District. In his day, Adams had worshiped at all the churches of Washington and had been personally acquainted with most of their pastors.

Next followed the Committee of Arrangements, composed of one Member of the House from each State and territory. Young Abraham Lincoln represented the State of Illinois.

A Committee of Escort similarly represented the States and territories. Then came the funeral carriage, flanked by 12 honorary pallbearers, including John C. Calhoun. Adams had known Calhoun as a friend and colleague during his Presidency, and had argued with him many times. Each had thought ill-natured things about the other in the heat of political controversy, yet each had respected the other as a man and a statesman.

The family, represented by Charles Francis Adams and Mary Hellen Adams, followed in carriages after the hearse. After them came the Sergeant at Arms of the House and the Members of the House, preceded by the Speaker and the Clerk. Behind the House were the Senate and its officers in corresponding order.

After the Congress, marched the President of the United States, James Polk. The Justices of the Supreme Court followed. President Madison had appointed Adams to the Court, but Adams had declined the office.

Next came the foreign diplomatic corps. Adams had been America's greatest diplomat during the first half century of our independence when were laid the foundations of American foreign policy.

Finally followed a procession of Government officials, military and naval officers, members of State legislatures, the Corporation of Washington, the Columbia Typographical Society, the faculty and students of Georgetown College and of the Columbian College, and members of literary institutions, fire companies, and other organizations and societies of the District of Columbia. With all of these Adams had had close and friendly relationships during his many years in the Nation's Capital.

Following these national honors the body rested temporarily in the tomb of the Congressional Cemetery pending its conveyance to Quincy. A week after the

ceremonies at Washington, the Committee of Escort entrained to take John Quincy Adams back to Massachusetts.

John Quincy Adams' death at his post of duty touched the imagination of his countrymen as nothing had since the deaths of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson on the 4th of July in 1826, the 50th anniversary of American independence. People sensed in a dramatic way the breaking of the last personal link between the Founding Fathers and the men of a new and uncertain era. All along the funeral train's route, flags were at half-mast. Business was suspended in the towns where the funeral party stopped for local tributes. Along the countryside people stood with bowed heads as the train passed by with its black-draped car. The Nation experienced an outpouring of eulogies, elegies, obituaries, requiems, odes, poems, orations, sermons, resolutions, biographical sketches, anecdotes, reminiscences, and editorials in praise of the venerable Yankee patriot and public servant. Newspapers printed selections from his verse, quotations from his letters and his sayings, illustrations of his steady habits, and statements of his religious opinions. The obsequies developed into what amounted to a countrywide ceremony, a rejoicing that the Republic should have produced such a great and honorable man and so notable a Christian as John Quincy Adams.

Boston, which would not make John Quincy Adams wholly her own while he lived, now took him to herself in death. Upon news of his passing, the Massachusetts Legislature, which four times had declined to elevate him from the U.S. House of Representatives to the U.S. Senate, listened to eulogies and passed resolutions extolling his republican simplicity of manners, his elevated morals, his Christian virtues, and his reverence for religion and its institutions:

With melancholy pleasure, we behold such a public servant, when summoned to his final account, falling at the post of his duty.

Bostonians thronged the streets when the funeral train arrived. A distinguished local committee received the escort, and amid tolling bells took the coffin to Faneuil Hall, where many were waiting in mourning. Conspicuously placed inscriptions listed the State and National posts that Adams had held from boyhood through old age. Over the entrance to Faneuil Hall, grasped in an eagle's beak, was a placard:

This is the last of Earth—I am content.

Beneath:

John Quincy Adams, aged 81, Born a citizen of Massachusetts. Died a citizen of the United States.

Between the galleries above the auditorium were these words of George Washington in 1797:

John Quincy Adams is the most valuable character we have abroad and the ablest of all our diplomatic corps.

Adams' onetime enemy and later friend, Joseph T. Buckingham, State senator from Middlesex County, who had delivered a eulogy in the legislature, received the body from the congressional

committee and consigned it to Mayor Josiah Quincy of Boston for delivery to the townsmen of Quincy. Adam's lifetime friend, Mayor Quincy, said:

This is no mere pageant. The spots on which this bier rests on its journey to the grave will not be marked by visible tokens . . . but associations and recollections shall cluster there, inspiring the living with the spirit of the dead; and, should the time ever come when distance and difference of interest shall seem for a moment to weaken the bonds of the Union, we will remember that our sister States sympathized with us in our grief as readily as their fathers rushed to our assistance in peril.

Tomorrow, he said, the townspeople of Quincy would mourn the loss of a fellow citizen not so much as a statesman but as a friend:

He will be "gathered to his fathers," and how great is the significance of the expression. When again shall the tomb of a President of the United States open its doors to receive a son that has filled the same office?

All that was mortal of Massachusetts' illustrious son remained in the Cradle of Liberty until the following day, when escorting committees, National, State, and municipal, entrained for Quincy. There a town meeting had already adopted resolutions of affection and respect "to the truthful expositor of the principles upon which our republican institutions are based, a champion of the universal rights of man, and a promulgator of those ideas of human freedom shadowed forth in the Declaration of Independence and destined yet for a long time to agitate the world, till the rights of man, as man, are everywhere fully and practically acknowledged."

A marshaled procession of town fathers and Norfolk County officers met the State and National escorts at the then new railroad station.

After a brief repose at the Adams Mansion, they followed the remains to the Stone Temple, under a final salute of gunfire from atop Penn's Hill, where the boy John Quincy Adams and his mother, Abigail, had watched the Battle of Bunker Hill across Back Bay. Amid the tears of old friends and neighbors, the pastor, William Lunt, preached a moving sermon based on a text from Revelation 2:10:

Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.

Then Adams' neighbors carried his remains to the family tomb that he himself had prepared in the churchyard.

Perhaps the best epitaph to the memory of John Quincy Adams was the one that his son Charles placed on the front wall of the Unitarian Church in Quincy:

Near this place reposes all that could die of John Quincy Adams, son of John and Abigail Smith Adams, sixth President of the United States. Born 11 July, 1767, amidst the storms of civil commotion, he nursed the vigor which nerves a statesman and a patriot, and the faith which inspires a Christian. For more than half a century, whenever his country called for his labors, in either hemisphere or in any capacity, he never spared them in her cause. On the twenty-fourth of December 1814, he signed the second treaty with Great Britain which restored peace within her borders; on the twenty-third of February, 1848, he closed sixteen years of eloquent defense of the lessons of

his youth by dying at his post in her great national council. A son worthy of his father, a citizen shedding glory on his country, a scholar ambitious to advance mankind, this Christian sought to walk humbly in the sight of his God.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on this July 11, we observe the 200th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest sons of Massachusetts, and one of our outstanding Americans, John Quincy Adams.

He was born in 1767 in the North Parish of Braintree, the son of John and Abigail Adams. He was the only son in American history to occupy the great office which his father had won before him, the Presidency of the United States.

He served his country for many years and in many different roles. He accompanied his father when the treaty of peace was negotiated which ended the Revolution. He was an American representative in the negotiations which terminated the War of 1812.

He served as an Ambassador to Great Britain, as a member of the Massachusetts Senate in 1802, and as a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts from 1803 until 1808. He was the American representative to the Government of the Netherlands.

George Washington said of his diplomatic activities:

John Quincy Adams is the most valuable character we have abroad and the ablest of all our diplomatic corps.

John Quincy Adams was appointed Secretary of State by President Monroe. The Monroe Doctrine of December 2, 1823, was in large measure the result of the labors of Adams as Secretary of State.

He won the Presidency in 1824 in an election contest decided in the House of Representatives. His inaugural address contained a masterful plan for American internal improvements; and in foreign affairs he was a master.

After the strenuous presidential election campaign of 1828, and the election of Andrew Jackson, he returned to his beloved home in Quincy, Mass., where he expected to enjoy the retirement from public affairs to which he had long aspired. Yet he was not permitted by the voters of the Plymouth congressional district to remain inactive. He was elected by them to the U.S. House of Representatives beginning with the 22d Congress, and was reelected to the next eight Congresses, serving for almost 17 years before his death on February 23, 1846. It was in the House of Representatives that John Quincy Adams made a major part of his most notable record.

His death, universally lamented, came as he was at work in the Chamber of the House of Representatives in which he had served with such distinction. He was the only former Chief Executive in our history who served in the House after his presidential term.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate the gentleman in the well for the very brilliant and ex-

haustive and illuminating and impressive and eloquent address he has delivered on one of the great leaders of American history, John Quincy Adams. I recognize that the distinguished gentleman in the well of the House, my good friend the Honorable JAMES ANTHONY BURKE, has the great honor and privilege of representing the district that was once represented by the great President John Quincy Adams. I might say he is an illustrious successor of a very illustrious Member of the Congress and a very illustrious President.

I feel anything I might say with respect to the contributions to our country of one of our great forebears might be like carrying coals to Newcastle, but nevertheless I want the gentleman to know how much I appreciate hearing this and how very impressive his remarks were regarding this great American. I associate myself with his remarks and the analysis and recital the distinguished gentleman has made about John Quincy Adams.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and my fellow member on the Committee on Armed Services in commending the gentleman in the well for this timely and most appropriate recognition of our sixth President.

John Quincy Adams has long been one of my favorites in history. I am constantly impressed, as I walk the halls of this Capitol, that he once walked here. I oftentimes go to the place in the old House Chamber, now Statuary Hall, where he always resided. Rumor and story are that he had a certain place where he could overhear, because of the acoustic effects, the Members of the opposition in their plans and strategy sessions.

Most of all, however, John Quincy Adams was recognized by the first Senator from Missouri, elected by the Missouri Assembly and known now as a magnificent Missourian in book and recorded prose.

At the risk of tittering when greater larks sing on high. I would like to join the gentleman, because I think John Quincy Adams' greatest contribution was the fact that he recognized that in a representative republic it was perhaps as great an honor to represent the people in this body as it was to be elected as the Chief Executive Officer. He served in the House of Representatives after having served as the sixth President of the United States. I certainly compliment the gentleman in the well. I wonder oftentimes whether we fail to appreciate the fact that such great men in history have walked these same halls where the gentleman in the well and others of us strive mightily to emulate our predecessors. I thank the gentleman for what he has brought to the body today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my commendation to the gentleman in the well for bringing this to the attention of the House. I believe in my first study of history I felt a great sense of disappointment that John Quincy Adams was elected rather than "Old Hickory," Andrew Jackson. But I have since recovered from that and, following the illustrious career of the great President Adams and also following the illustrious career of the gentleman who is now in the well, who represents the same district, I share the sentiments of all those who honor John Quincy Adams for his great service to the State of Massachusetts and to the Nation.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the House in calling attention to the important anniversary occurring on this date—the birth 200 years ago of John Quincy Adams, destined to become the sixth President of the United States.

John Quincy Adams was the famous son of a famous family—a man who gave most of his life to dedicated service for his country.

He was a man who served in the House of Representatives from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts for nearly 17 years. He was a man who rose to the high office of President of the United States—a man who after losing presidential reelection in 1828 nevertheless continued to serve his country by returning to the House of Representatives until his death in 1847.

But John Quincy Adams also served his country in other ways than as an occupant of the White House or a Member of the House of Representatives.

In 1794, he served with great distinction as the American representative to the Netherlands and later in a similar post in Berlin.

He was a member of the Massachusetts Senate in 1802 and 1803 when the people of his State via the Great and General Court of the Commonwealth sent him to the U.S. Senate.

In 1817, John Quincy Adams was invited by President Monroe to become Secretary of State, an office he held until he was himself elected to the Presidency.

John Quincy Adams was a great statesman, a great patriot, and a great American who represented a congressional district in Massachusetts now represented by an equally outstanding American, an equally great statesman and patriot—my distinguished colleague and good friend, the Honorable JAMES A. BURKE.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable JAMES A. BURKE, who has requested a special order today to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams.

It is indeed appropriate that we observe this anniversary, for John Quincy Adams was the sixth President of the

United States from 1825 to 1829. All of us are familiar with the contributions of this great American patriot, soldier, and statesman who served his country in the diplomatic service, as Secretary of State, in his State legislature in Massachusetts, in the U.S. House of Representatives, in the U.S. Senate, and as President of our wonderful country.

His whole life was dedicated to public service, and his sincerity and dedication of purpose in the best interests of the people of America were evidenced time and time again during his career. Indeed, our sixth President's depth of feeling for his beloved country can best be expressed in his own historic words when he delivered his inaugural address on March 4, 1825:

Intentions upright and pure, a heart devoted to the welfare of our country, and the unceasing application of all the faculties allotted to me to her service are all the pledges that I can give for the faithful performance of the arduous duties I am to undertake.

My distinguished colleague, Congressman BURKE, represents the same congressional district of Massachusetts which John Quincy Adams represented so ably for nearly 17 years. Mr. Burke was elected to the 86th Congress, and was reelected to the 87th, the 88th, the 89th, and the 90th Congress. His outstanding service on the House Ways and Means Committee and in the Congress have merited the admiration and confidence of both his colleagues and his constituents. It is indeed a privilege to serve in this body with my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts who is continuing to serve his country in the same noble and lofty traditions established by his predecessor, John Quincy Adams.

It is my pleasure to join in this commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of a great American—John Quincy Adams.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, John Quincy Adams, diplomat, Senator, Congressman, and President of the United States, created one of the most remarkable and valuable careers in the service of this Nation ever recorded. Although we are now commemorating the 200th anniversary of his birth, his place in history has not been eroded, his brilliant contribution has not been dimmed.

Had his service to the country been limited to his diplomatic efforts, his skillful handling of American affairs in the Netherlands and Russia, and his talent as a negotiator at the peace conference with England after the War of 1812, his work would be memorable. Had his single term as U.S. Senator been his only public role, with his staunch defense of the Louisiana Purchase and his courageous support of President Jefferson's measures of retaliation against overbearing Britain, that too would have been memorable.

Had his presidential term, at the outset of America's industrial development and western expansion, during which John Quincy Adams worked diligently for advancement in those areas, been his final accomplishment, it would have been a memorable climax to an outstanding career of public service.

But, weary and frustrated, John Quincy Adams answered once again the

call of his fellow citizens and returned to Washington as U.S. Congressman; there to write perhaps the most outstanding chapter of his career. For as Congressman Adams, the aging statesman became the forceful advocate of a firm foreign policy by opposing the cavalier French attitude toward its obligations to this Nation, and of fiscal responsibility by supporting the controversial Bank of the United States. Most important, John Quincy Adams spoke out, virtually alone, against the notorious "gag rule" which suppressed the political activities of those who opposed slavery. Year after year he ceaselessly attacked the tactics of those who preferred the old order to civil liberty.

John Quincy Adams' probity and strict integrity, his courage and unflinching independence, enflamed his campaigns to promote the national interest above those of State and party. His vision and endurance, his steadfast refusal to desert a cause he thought right are qualities that serve as a model for those who have followed him into public service.

John Quincy Adams, in public office for most of his six adult decades, has earned a place in history as a magistrate who sacrificed all for his country and his conscience.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a considerable feeling for history that I rise today to join Congressman BURKE in honoring the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts.

A distinguished son of one of America's most fervent Revolutionary families, he helped to perpetuate a dynasty which for well over a hundred years has continued to provide the Nation and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with thoughtful, sensitive, and intelligent leadership. As Secretary of State, as President of the United States, and as a Member of this great deliberative body he contributed mightily to the successful growth and development of the United States.

John Quincy Adams was a frequent visitor to my own district in western Massachusetts. On one such visit he wrote that the view from Pocumtuck Mountain overlooking historic Deerfield "is a view unexcelled by none, not excepting the Bay of Naples." So like an old friend and with a profound admiration for his unusual intellectual attainments, I join with my distinguished colleague from the eastern part of the Commonwealth in paying this tribute to John Quincy Adams whose greatness in history is secure and in recent years ever growing.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Massachusetts has produced many great patriots and leaders, among them President John Quincy Adams, our sixth President.

The 11th District of Massachusetts has been particularly blessed in that it was represented here in Congress by President Adams for almost 20 years. On this day, the 200th anniversary of the birth of that great American, we salute the great State of Massachusetts and its outstanding Representatives both past and present.

The 11th District at present is repre-

sented by a man well qualified to serve in the tradition of his illustrious predecessor. Our colleague, JAMES A. BURKE is a highly respected and effective Member of this body. We who have the pleasure of serving with him congratulate the people of his district on their excellent choice and good judgment in sending such a capable and dedicated person to represent them in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE], has taken this time today in recognition of the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams, our sixth President and for nearly 17 years a Member of this body. Massachusetts can be justly proud of a number of statesmen who helped forge the foundations of our freedom. Certainly, no family was more distinguished than the Adams. Two Presidents and numerous other public figures from the Commonwealth have carried the famous name of Adams right into our own time.

It was a measure of the esteem in which John Quincy Adams was held that the people of his congressional district returned him to the U.S. House of Representatives after his unsuccessful bid for reelection against Andrew Jackson in 1828. With characteristic Yankee stubbornness his constituents insisted on retaining the benefits of his public service, even though the country as a whole had failed to return him to office.

The long and active career of public service of John Quincy Adams reminds us of the statement of another famous Adams, Samuel Adams who, a month after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, said:

I ask no greater blessing than to share with you the common danger and the common glory.

In marking the birth of John Quincy Adams today, we also mark a notable tradition of public service.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, for almost 17 years the 12th Congressional District of Massachusetts was represented in the U.S. House of Representatives by one of the outstanding statesmen of early American history. Following his defeat in the bitter presidential election of 1828, John Quincy Adams, the able if controversial sixth President of the United States, was pressed into service by the people of the Plymouth Congressional District. Although population changes have altered the makeup of the 12th District, much of that original district remains in my congressional district, and I am particularly honored to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to my predecessor.

John Quincy Adams, who was born just 200 years ago today, served his Nation and his constituency conscientiously and tirelessly. One of the ironies of history is that this dedicated statesman was not fully appreciated until his death at the age of 81. When the Nation learned of his death following a fatal stroke in the House Chamber, however, John Quincy Adams was accorded the highest honors and praise. Eulogies, ora-

tions, and obituaries in acclaim of the venerable public servant flooded the Nation. Even the Massachusetts Legislature, which had four times refused to elevate the Congressman from the 12th District to the rank of U.S. Senator, passed resolutions extolling his manner, his morals, and his virtues.

Mr. Speaker, if John Quincy Adams was not accorded as much respect, love, and admiration as his 60 years of public service merited while he lived, at least his fellow countrymen realized upon his death that America had lost one of its outstanding statesmen. I am indeed awed at the thought that such a man was my predecessor in the U.S. House of Representatives—awed, and more than a bit inspired by the example of this illustrious son of Massachusetts and the United States of America. John Quincy Adams was, as his son declared in the epitaph on the front wall of the Quincy Unitarian Church, "a son worthy of his father, a citizen shedding glory on his country, a scholar ambitious to advance mankind."

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, July 11 marks the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams of Braintree—Quincy—Mass.

The people of the United States best remember him as the sixth President of the United States, following James Monroe and preceding Andrew Jackson. My colleagues may remember that the House of Representatives voted him into the Presidency following his failure to win an electoral college majority over Henry Clay and Andrew Jackson. The people of Massachusetts also remember that John Quincy Adams served with distinction in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. However, many people may forget that John Quincy Adams also served as a major policymaker with great distinction in James Monroe's Cabinet.

Prior to his appointment as Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams served as American Minister to the Netherlands, Prussia, England, and Russia. His careful study of European politics led him to believe that the security of the fledgling United States lay in the development of a strong republican form of government, necessary to counteract the aggressive power and intentions of the European nations. As Secretary of State, 1817 to 1824, he successfully continued his advocacy of a strong Union despite the opposition of the "weak constructionists." This opposition later hampered his efforts as President.

Mr. Speaker, his efforts to form a strong Republic are best illustrated by the policy position adopted during his tenure as Monroe's Secretary of State. In successfully advocating the purchase of Florida and the prohibition of slavery in most of the Louisiana Territory, despite the opposition of the "weak constructionists," he strengthened the development of Presidential power, necessary for a strong Union. With full realization of the security requirements of our country and the significance of this country to independence movements in Latin America, he became the principal architect of the Monroe Doctrine. This

doctrine and the foreign policy aspects of Washington's "Farewell Address," have served since as the historical premises of American foreign policy.

Truly, the pinnacle of public acclaim and personal achievement for John Quincy Adams was his election to the Presidency. However, I believe that his successful efforts in Monroe's Cabinet produced the most lasting effects for the development of our republican form of government. There is no question in my mind that in word and deed this great patriot and son of Massachusetts provided essential cornerstones for our Union which emerged greatly strengthened from the test of the Civil War.

John Quincy Adams, like Abraham Lincoln, was concerned with the preservation of this Union, "the last, best hope of earth."

Mr. BOLAND. July 11 is the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams, a truly great son of the American Revolution and of Massachusetts. When he was born in 1767, the son of John Adams and Abigail Smith Adams, the stirring events that were to lead to our national independence were the concern of Americans throughout the colonies. With his mother he witnessed the Battle of Bunker Hill as a boy, watching the patriots of the Boston area subdue the power of the mighty British Army. With his father he traveled to the peace negotiations which ended the War of Independence with the triumph of American arms.

He served his beloved country for many years, always with a full measure of devotion and intelligence. He was our ambassador to Great Britain and to the Netherlands. He was a U.S. Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He was Secretary of State under President Monroe, and helped in formulating and drafting the famous Monroe Doctrine which was enunciated in a message of December 2, 1823.

As the sixth President of the United States, Adams wisely guided his country in domestic and foreign affairs. After his Presidential term he served his Massachusetts constituents for almost 17 years as their Representative in the U.S. House of Representatives.

He died while still active in the affairs of that House and of the Nation. His death brought forth expressions of admiration for him and his record of public service from all parts of that country which he had served so well. In observing the anniversary of his birth, we pay respect to the memory of one of our country's greatest men.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams, sixth President of the United States. I would like to join with our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable JAMES A. BURKE, in paying tribute to an American who dedicated his life to his country.

Adams started his career in government in 1782, at the age of 15, when he joined his father in Paris and acted as an "additional secretary" to the American commissioners negotiating the peace treaty concluding the War of Independence. He then returned to the United

States to attend law school, after which he opened a law office in Boston. Adams wrote a series of papers controverting some of Thomas Paine's doctrines in the "Rights of Man," and later another series which supported the administration's neutral policy toward England and France. Soon after these writings, President Washington appointed him Minister to the Netherlands and other posts followed later.

In 1802, John Quincy Adams was elected to the Massachusetts Senate, and the following year he was sent to Washington as a U.S. Senator. He was not a strict party man, and his support of the 1807 embargo, recommended by Jefferson, met extreme opposition which ultimately resulted in the naming of a successor to his Senate seat.

President Madison appointed Adams as one of the American commissioners to negotiate a treaty of the War of 1812. The result was the Treaty of Ghent in 1814.

He served as U.S. Minister to England, and subsequently in 1817 became Secretary of State in President Monroe's Cabinet. The Monroe Doctrine, which dramatically has affected U.S. foreign policy since its formulation in 1823, was primarily the work of John Quincy Adams during his term of office as Secretary of State.

The 8 years of Monroe's Presidency are known as the "era of good feeling." As his second term drew to a close, the era of good feeling among his official advisers ended rapidly. Adams; Calhoun, the Secretary of War; and Crawford, the Secretary of the Treasury, each aspired to succeed him. In addition, Henry Clay and Andrew Jackson were also candidates for the Presidency.

No candidate received a majority of the electoral votes, however, and the election was taken to the House of Representatives where Adams was elected President after Henry Clay had given him his support. In return, Adams named Clay the Secretary of State. Unjust charges of "bargain and corruption" followed, and the feud thus created between Adams and Jackson greatly influenced the history of the United States.

Adams served only one term in the Presidency, from 1824 to 1828. He was defeated in his bid for a second term by Andrew Jackson. After 2 years of private life, Adams once again decided to return to public service. In 1830 he was elected to Congress where he served until his death in 1847. It was said that in some respects his service in Congress was the most noteworthy part of his career. While in Congress he was an avid opponent of the extension of slavery and the champion of the right of petition. His prolonged fight for the repeal of the so-called "gag laws" was one of the most dramatic contests in the history of this body. Adams contended that these gag rules were a direct violation of the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution and refused to be silenced on the question. When it was suggested to him that his acceptance of this position would degrade an ex-President, Adams replied that no person could be degraded by serving the people as a Representative in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, John Quincy Adams had a distinguished career of service to his country. Few men in American public life have possessed more intrinsic worth, more independence, more public spirit, and more ability than the man we honor today on the occasion of the bicentennial of his birth. He well deserves this honor as a great statesman and leader of our country during the early and formative years of our Nation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] in recognition of the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams, a great servant of both my State and my Nation.

I gladly pay tribute to an outstanding son of Massachusetts who served his State and his country with great distinction over a long and illustrious public career. John Quincy Adams eagerly applied his abundant talents to a number of elected positions. Our Nation is better for having had the benefit of his energy and his wisdom at a vital phase of its development.

Many people remember John Quincy Adams principally for his term as the sixth President of our United States. He served that noble position ably. Those of us who serve in the House of Representatives, however, feel a special kinship with him because no one exemplified more the lofty position of the House of Representatives in our governmental structure than the man we honor today. By his action in serving in our distinguished body, after his term as President, John Quincy Adams demonstrated clearly his appreciation for the coequal standing of the independent branches of the Government. This principle of independence and equality of stature is one of the most valuable foundations of our Republic.

Once again I thank the distinguished gentleman of the House of Representatives for permitting me, on this occasion, to offer this tribute to the memory of a distinguished American.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on July 11 we celebrate the 200th anniversary of a great American who served for almost 17 years in the House. John Quincy Adams is known to most Americans as the sixth President of the United States. Few know that after his Presidential term he came to the U.S. House of Representatives where he served both his district and his country with all his great ability, all his vast energy, and all his broad experience of men and issues.

He was born in 1767 in Braintree, Mass., where the revolutionary enthusiasm that would lead eventually to the assertion of American independence from England was strong indeed. With his mother, Abigail Smith Adams, young John Quincy Adams even watched a battle of the revolution being fought, the battle of Bunker Hill. He was a true son of the Revolution, just as he was a true son of that doughty patriot, John Adams. In all of our long history, John Quincy Adams was the only son of a President of the United States to himself become President.

On February 13, 1778, as a boy of 10, John Quincy Adams boarded the frigate

Boston with his father who has been named one of three commissioners to negotiate a treaty with France. John and John Quincy Adams arrived in France when American prestige was almost entirely lacking. By the careers of both father and son that prestige became a force to be feared in the councils of the great powers of the world of their eras.

John Quincy Adams was graduated from Harvard College in 1787 and then studied law for 3 years. He practiced his profession, wrote political articles for newspapers, and received an appointment in 1794 as the American representative to the court of the Netherlands. After serving as the American representative in Berlin he returned to Boston to practice law.

He was elected to the Massachusetts Senate in 1802. The following year he was elected by the Massachusetts Legislature to be a U.S. Senator, and served until 1808. Then came energetic service to his alma mater, Harvard, as a professor of rhetoric and oratory. He left academic life to serve his country once again when President Madison named him the American representative to the Russian Government. Adams served as a member of the group which negotiated a treaty with Britain ending the War of 1812 and as Ambassador to the Court of St. James.

He became Secretary of State in the Monroe administration, directed the negotiations by which Florida was ceded to the United States by Spain, and was responsible in large measure for the principles embodied in the Monroe Doctrine.

As President of the United States from 1824 to 1828 he served his beloved country with determination, skill, and foresight. Returning to his Massachusetts home after his Presidential term, he found that his services were again required by his friends in the Plymouth Congressional District. To both his constituents and his country he rendered distinguished service for almost 17 years as the only former President of the United States to serve in this body.

We salute his name and memory on this 200th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend my able and warmly esteemed colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] for his special order commemorating the 200th birthday of the sixth President of the United States and a former Member of the House of Representatives, John Quincy Adams.

My joy in participating in this occasion is a very personal one. Victoria Adams, a lineal descendant of John Quincy Adams, was a high school teacher in the city which is my home and which I love, Chicago. Victoria Adams taught American history at Calumet High School, in the district adjoining the second, which I have the honor to represent. Moreover, Victoria Adams spent her last days in the Second District and she was well known at the University of Chicago.

After her death, her will disclosed that Victoria Adams had willed her fortune of \$85,000 to the University of Chicago to establish scholarships in American history for the students of Calumet High School.

John Quincy Adams was a great

American. He was Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Monroe and gave dynamic force and drive to the Monroe Doctrine. He was elected President of the United States by the House of Representatives, of which later he was a Member and in which he died in his 81st year. The couch upon which he died is now preserved in the office of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the district in Massachusetts served in this historic body for so many years by the great American whose memory we honor today is indeed signally fortunate in the type of representation it has enjoyed. I know of no one in this body in the 90th Congress who is held in higher esteem and affection than John Quincy Adams' successor, the Honorable JAMES A. BURKE.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute today on July 11 to the sixth President of the United States, John Quincy Adams, born 200 years ago in 1767 during the crisis-filled period that preceded the Revolution.

He served his country long, faithfully, and well. He accompanied his famous father, John Adams, to the treaty negotiations that brought the Revolution to its victorious end. He participated in the negotiations with Britain which ended the War of 1812.

He served as one of his country's best diplomats when he was America's representative to the Netherlands and to Great Britain, and President Monroe's Secretary of State. George Washington once said:

John Quincy Adams is the most valuable character we have abroad and the ablest of all our diplomatic corps.

When the Monroe Doctrine was enunciated in a Presidential message of 1823, the arduous work of Secretary of State Adams was responsible for many of its great principles.

He was an able U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, dedicated President of the United States, and, for almost 17 years until he died in 1846, an exceptionally distinguished and conscientious Member of the House of Representatives.

John Quincy Adams was one of the greatest Americans of all time. On the 200th anniversary of his birth we salute his achievements; we pay homage to his record of public service; we honor his memory.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many brands of courage but few have been as commemorative as the courage that typified John Quincy Adams. This Massachusetts man's fortitude was of such caliber that another inimitable man from Massachusetts, the late President John F. Kennedy, saw fit to feature the resolute deeds of John Quincy Adams in his Pulitzer Prize winning book, "Profiles in Courage."

Few men have exercised their capacity for vision to the extent that was true of John Quincy Adams. Devoted to the principles imbued in him by his parents, John and Abigail Adams, he did not subvert his concept of national responsibility for the more immediate interests of his constituency. Risking his own popularity, he stood for the acquisition of western lands that were to add immeasurably to the vast richness of our

Nation. Though most of his constituents were merchants, he backed the Embargo Acts in an effort to strengthen first his country and, therefore, his own district.

This strength did not waver, his course withstood the hurricanes of time and circumstance. His perception encompassed not only his Nation but the globe. He envisioned a cohesive, autonomous hemisphere and implemented the Monroe Doctrine to insure its reality. President Kennedy once said:

This country cannot lie still in the harbors but must set sail.

John Quincy Adams served with distinction at that stormy helm.

I join with my colleagues on this the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams in giving this stalwart and noble statesman the tributes after his death that were due him in his lifetime.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams. It is much less a celebration of his birth, however, than it is a celebration of his accomplishments. The present shape of our Government and of our Nation were both influenced by his efforts.

During his lifetime of public service, Mr. Adams held a variety of important positions. He served as Ambassador to Great Britain and as the American representative to the Netherlands. He was a member of the Massachusetts Senate, a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, the Secretary of State under President Monroe, President of the United States, and served nearly 17 years in the House of Representatives.

His accomplishments in these positions were equal to the importance implied by their titles. In foreign affairs he was a strong advocate of a firm foreign policy. He was one of the chief negotiators at the peace conference with England after the War of 1812. As Secretary of State he played a key role in the formulation of the Monroe Doctrine, a policy as important today as it was in 1823.

His domestic accomplishments were equally impressive. He successfully advocated the purchase of Florida and defended the Louisiana Purchase. As President he proposed a broad plan of internal improvements and generally promoted the western expansion and increased industrialization throughout the Nation.

He was one of the earliest and most vocal opponents of slavery, and once wrote that a life devoted to the problem of emancipation would be one "nobly spent or sacrificed." He spoke out, virtually alone, against the "gag rule," which suppressed political activities of those who opposed slavery.

Mr. Adams was the only ex-President ever to serve in the House of Representatives, and his 17 years in this body produced some of his greatest accomplishments. His death, following a stroke on the floor of the House, was a dramatic climax to a distinguished career. The legacy he left for the generations which followed remains today as an example of the great accomplishments of a truly brilliant and dedicated public servant.

We who serve in the House today would do well to emulate his example.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in a country such as this where so much of what we now have we owe to the wisdom and courage of our forefathers, it is right to occasionally take time out to acknowledge their contribution to America. John Quincy Adams was certainly one of those to whom we owe the most, and on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of his birth, I wish to express my appreciation of his accomplishments.

Adams devoted the greater part of his life to public service both at home and abroad. In 1802, after serving for 7 years in Europe, he was elected to the Massachusetts State Senate, and 6 months later he was elected to the U.S. Senate. Adams went from here back into diplomatic service and was largely responsible for the peace settlement following the War of 1812. As a diplomat, Adams was greatly responsible for the truth of his own description of U.S. foreign relations:

America, in the assembly of nations, since her admission among them, has invariably, though often fruitlessly, held forth to them the hand of honest friendship, of equal freedom, of generous reciprocity. She has uniformly spoken among them, though often to heedless and often to disdainful ears, the language of equal liberty, equal justice, equal rights.

In 1817 President Monroe appointed Adams Secretary of State. In filling this position Adams drew on his vast wealth of political experience and as usual he served with tremendous vigor. A great deal of the credit for the Monroe Doctrine belongs to him.

Adams became President in 1824. During his term in the White House he worked hard to bring about a large variety of improvements, especially in the field of education. He pursued these goals incessantly and with a self-restraint which was true to his concept of the ideal government.

In 1831 Adams began a period of service in Congress almost 17 years long which was probably the high point in his long public career. This made him the only ex-President ever to serve in the House. He was always knowledgeable and conscientious, and he served on many of the most important committees. Throughout, he brought all of his influence and powers to bear in defending the rights of man.

In February of 1848 he suffered a stroke from which he never recovered, just after responding to the call of his name in the House. Few have devoted themselves to the pursuit of their ideals with the persistence, honor, and courage of John Quincy Adams.

Today we do well to follow Adams' own advice which he quoted from a barbarian chieftain who defended his country against the Roman invasion:

Think of your forefathers and of your posterity.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE], in observing the 200th anniversary of the birth of a great

American, John Quincy Adams. Ambassador, Congressman, Senator, Secretary of State, and President, Adams was a truly remarkable statesman and patriot.

As just one example of President Adams' noble legacy to our Nation's history, I would like to speak of one of his lesser known qualities—a brave and forthright respect and sympathy for the rights of minority groups. This characteristic of the gentlemen from Massachusetts is best illustrated by the Georgia-Indian controversy of the mid-1820's.

Pressure from wealthy plantation owners in the South caused the Indian Office to proclaim the Treaty of Indian Springs between the United States and the Creek Indian Nation. Signed in 1825, before Adams took office, the treaty was approved by the Senate. But the Creeks repudiated it and charged fraud. When after investigation, Adams found the Indians correct—the treaty had been signed by a Creek with no authority to agree to such a pact—he denounced the agreement as void.

Adams' respect for the Indians' rights was not widely shared and his action crippled him politically in the South and West. Historians, in fact, cite this incident as a contributing factor in President Adams' reelection defeat of 1828. This generation of Americans would do well to emulate John Quincy Adams' understanding and courage.

The residents of the 11th District of Massachusetts have reason for pride in the quality of their public servants as exemplified by John Quincy Adams and their present Representative, JAMES A. BURKE. As did his illustrious predecessor, Congressman BURKE enjoys the respect and esteem of all his colleagues in the House of Representatives for his ability, integrity, and patriotism.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my good friend and distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] in paying tribute to a great citizen.

John Quincy Adams, the son of the second President of the United States and himself the sixth President of the Republic, was above all an American. He foresaw a Nation based upon liberty and freedom which would stretch from ocean to ocean. From this vision he never strayed. As a young Senator, his support of the Louisiana Purchase led to condemnation by his Federalist colleagues from New England who had urged him to follow a sectional rather than national policy. His continued support for the territorial expansion of the new nation eventually alienated him from his former partners and led him into the party of the Jeffersonian Republicans.

As a Republican Secretary of State, his advocacy of freedom was not limited to the United States, and he worked for recognition of the right of peoples everywhere to throw off unrepresentative and tyrannical governments. Adams, one of the principal authors of the Monroe Doctrine, rejoiced at the end of Spanish colonial rule in South America.

A man of uncorruptible integrity, he steadfastly refused to become the partisan of any political faction. His blunt-

ness made him somewhat unpopular among his colleagues, but he never compromised when he felt the interests of the Nation were at stake. In all of the many positions in which he served his Nation and his God, he did what he believed was right without regard to the political consequences.

After his defeat for reelection to the Presidency in 1828, he planned to retire from public life; but in 1830, he accepted a nomination to the House of Representatives with the proviso that, if elected, he be allowed complete independence. Following his subsequent election to Congress, Adams embarked on what may have been the most monumental part of his career. The next 17 years were marked by a continuing fight against slavery and for the preservation of American liberties. A firm nationalist, Adams was an even more staunch believer in the principles for which the country stood. When the right of petition was circumscribed by the infamous "gag rule," Congressman Adams used every resource at his disposal to eliminate this violation of the first amendment. It was to his credit that he helped forge the link between the issues of freedom of speech and slavery, a tactic which significantly aided the antislavery forces. Adams had always believed the Declaration of Independence to be as much a part of the law of the land as the Constitution and that slavery was therefore antithetical to the American idea of universal equality. His untimely death in 1848 temporarily left a void in the meager ranks of those fighting what he termed the southern slavocracy, but the vacuum was soon to be filled by Charles Sumner and other proteges of Adams.

John Quincy Adams, Senator, Secretary of State, President, and Congressman, led perhaps the fullest career of public service of any American, past or present. His greatest memorial has been the growth of the continental American Nation dedicated to freedom and premised on the idea that all men are created equal.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

POSTAL RATES FOR NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS—AS WE GO DEEPER INTO THE RED, THE POSTAL SERVICE GETS MORE NONPROFIT EVERY DAY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, sympathy for a worthy cause is a good old American trait, but it has gone hogwild in the setting of ridiculously low postal rates for churches,

charities, and other nonprofit organizations. This is an area which Congress has long regarded as a "sacred cow." In advocating a more rational approach to postal rates, I have been besieged with arguments like the following:

"Would you penalize your poor country churches, struggling to mail out their weekly church bulletins? How can the Little Church in the Wildwood possibly survive if its fund drive is crippled by higher postal rates? Would you slap the crippled children in the face? Are you against the community chest? What about Father Flanagan's Boys Town and the Christmas seals?"

It is high time that Congress took a cold, hard look at the facts. Third-class mail was established as a special category in 1928—39 years ago. In the past 39 years, the rate for bulk mailings of nonprofit organizations have gone up exactly one-fourth cent, from 1 cent per piece to 1¼ cents per piece. In sharp contrast, over the same 39-year period, first-class rates have shot up from 2 cents to 5 cents. First-class rates, in other words, have already increased 150 percent during a period when third-class nonprofit rates went up a meager 25 percent. And the administration bill proposes a further increase in first-class rates to 6 cents.

When you consider that nonprofit third-class postal rates have gone up only one-fourth cent in the last 39 years, contrast this with the price of other items. In 1928, you could buy a pound loaf of bread for 9 cents; today, the cost is about 22 cents. In 1928, you could have a quart of milk delivered to your home for 14 cents; today, the price is doubled to about 28 cents.

HUGE VOLUME INCREASE IN NONPROFIT MAIL

As the postal rates for nonprofit organizations remained extremely low, more and more nonprofit organizations began to take advantage of the situation through larger mailings. These organizations now account for 17 percent of all bulk-rate third-class mail, as compared with only 8 percent in 1952. In the same period, the volume of nonprofit third-class mail has shot up 250 percent—from slightly over 800 million pieces to nearly 2.9 billion pieces of bulk-rate nonprofit third-class mail. Now let us contrast that with other third-class mail. During the same period since 1952, commercial bulk-rate third-class mail increased 58 percent, while the total mail volume was going up 52 percent over the same period.

In addition to the volume increase in third-class mail, many new organizations appear to be getting in under the nonprofit umbrella. The law defines a "qualified nonprofit organization" as "religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans or fraternal organizations, or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual."

Many nonprofit organizations are now mailing neckties, pins, souvenirs, and other items for which they are seeking monetary contributions. A number of these items are unsolicited. The increased volume of such unsolicited items slows the delivery of mail, and also competes

with private enterprise firms forced to pay higher postal rates.

NONPROFIT RATES SHOULD BE 50 PERCENT OF COMMERCIAL RATES

The Postal Policy Act of 1958, which is Public Law 85-426, states:

Postal rates and fees shall be adjusted from time to time as may be required to produce the amount of revenue approximately equal to the total cost of operating the postal establishment less the amount deemed to be attributable to the performance of public services.

Title II of the 1958 act also prescribed that the minimum charge per piece for third-class matter mailed in bulk by nonprofit organizations should be 50 percent of the charge for commercial mailings. As a result, when the commercial third-class bulk rate was raised from 2 to 2½ cents on July 1, 1960, the rate for other nonprofit organizations went up from 1 to 1¼ cents.

But in 1962, when the rates for commercial mailings were raised in stages to their current bulk rate level of 2¾ cents, the bulk rates for third-class mailings remained frozen at 1¼ cents. In addition, the 1962 legislation actually reduced the nonprofit bulk pound rate by about 40 percent. This was accomplished by reducing the pound rate on circulars mailed by nonprofit organizations from 16 cents to 9 cents, and on nonprofit books and catalogs from 10 cents a pound to 6 cents a pound.

I feel strongly that we ought to return to the policy established in the Postal Policy Act of 1958—that rates for nonprofit organizations should be 50 percent of the rates for commercial mailings. That is why my bill, H.R. 99, provides for a bulk rate of 2¼ cents a piece for nonprofit organizations, and 4½ cents a piece for commercial bulk mailings.

Several critics have pointed out that percentage-wise the rate increases for nonprofit organizations are steeper than for commercial organizations. But that is only because these rates are initially so low. As Postmaster General O'Brien very fairly pointed out in his testimony on May 9 before the House Postal Rates Subcommittee:

Even with the proposed increased such organizations would still maintain large and valuable postal preferences. Currently, the public service cost of handling nonprofit mail exceeds \$200 million yearly, nearly 40 percent of all public service costs.

ADVISORY PANEL ON POSTAL RATES

In 1965, the Advisory Panel on Postal Rates, headed by former Representative Robert Ramspeck of Georgia, made some very pertinent observations on postal rates for nonprofit organizations:

We question whether these subsidies should be intermingled with postal rates. If there is merit in these subsidies, they should be identified and included as direct payments from the budgets on the Federal agencies charged with overseeing public welfare activities. Since rate policy and subsidies are now commingled, the Postmaster General is in a position that compels him to propose rates based on extraordinary welfare considerations as well as on conventional value-of-service and cost criteria. . . . Funds for subsidies should be provided by direct appropriations, to the agency over-

seeing the welfare activity, rather than as a hidden cost in the postal budget.

Philosophically, the increasing subsidy to the nonprofit organizations has disturbed thoughtful students. What it means is that the general taxpayer is forced to pay to make up the postal deficit caused by causes in which he may not believe. "Why should I be taxed to subsidize someone else's religion?" pertinently asked a writer from Pittsburgh. The question well might be raised also whether the Post Office Department, with the prime responsibility of delivering the mail on time—which it increasingly finds difficult to accomplish efficiently and speedily—should also be burdened with extending assistance to all sorts of causes.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER], a few months ago gave me a packet of junk mail he had received from one of his constituents, T. A. Hamilton, of 3709 Hillsboro Road, Louisville, Ky. Over a period of several weeks, Mr. Hamilton accumulated packages including three neckties, two throat lozenges, a plastic thermometer, a package of Christmas cards, two packets of name and address labels, a recipe book, a gasoline credit card, numerous catalogs and coupons, and a set of gummed stickers with prayers printed on them.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS SHOULD BE FROM
THE HEART

All of this material came to Mr. Hamilton unsolicited, and most of it came from nonprofit organizations at the low nonprofit, third-class postal rates. Many sent articles of merchandise and asked for a contribution. Mr. Hamilton probably spoke for a great many people when he said:

I have nothing against charitable organizations. However, I believe that our giving to such organizations should come from the heart, and should not be placed under the pressure of modern-day merchandising.

Under the current rates, it is really fantastic what and how much a nonprofit organization can mail. Up to eight publications can be mailed by these organizations under the nonprofit second-class rates for as little as 1 penny. Furthermore, there is no extra charge for long hauls. For 1 penny, the post office will take these eight publications mailed in New York and deliver them in Hawaii.

If a nonprofit organization wishes to make a fund solicitation through third-class mail, the post office will deliver four fund solicitation letters for only a nickel. These rates have been the same since 1962, although other postal rates were raised in that year.

NEW RATES ON NONPROFIT ADVERTISING

I am pleased to note that the administration bill contains new language to cover nonprofit publications that carry more than 10 percent advertising. There will be a moderately higher rate scaled upward in proportion to the volume of advertising carried by these publications. This is essentially the same postage principle which has long been applied by Congress for commercial publications. Yet under the new proposal, nonprofit

organizations would continue to receive huge postage concessions.

As my colleagues are aware, the Internal Revenue Service is looking into the problem of tax exemptions and advertising in nonprofit publications. It is my understanding that Congress will be asked to curb the tax exemptions that permit churches and other charitable organizations to buy up firms which then operate in competition with taxpaying businesses. I believe this is a healthy development, and many prominent church officials have endorsed these moves.

The postal deficit which is caused by third-class mail sent by nonprofit organizations has been rising. The difference between fully allocated costs and the revenues received from nonprofit third-class mailings was \$58 million in fiscal year 1963. These costs rose almost 62 percent in 3 years for a total of \$94 million in fiscal 1966, and are now estimated to be running at a rate of about \$100 million a year. The deficit caused by second-class nonprofit mailings has risen to about \$110 million per year. This means that the annual deficit of second- and third-class nonprofit mailings runs over \$200 million annually. Perhaps this could be labeled "How To Fail in Business While Really Trying."

In conclusion, I trust that the Congress will face up to this problem directly and raise the rates on both commercial and nonprofit mailings when the postal rate bill is considered.

INVESTMENT IN FUTURE EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in this technological age, our stockpile of highly skilled manpower is as important to the economic welfare and military defense of our Nation as our stockpile of industrial raw materials and nuclear weapons.

We must depend upon our colleges and technical schools to train these leaders of the future, and we must take steps now to be certain that our colleges will be able to do the job properly.

The problem goes far beyond the question of providing trained technological manpower. Virtually all Government agencies—at all levels of government—depend upon colleges for vital research into such fields as medicine, public health, defense, agriculture, space technology, air and water pollution, sociology and many others.

Our colleges must meet the demands of today, and the demands of the future. And as for the future, all of our institutions of higher education face an increasing problem during the next decade.

It has been estimated that 10 years from now, 12 million young men and women will be seeking entrance to institutions of higher learning in the United States.

Our college plants will have to double their present capacity to handle that wave of applicants. Faculties will have

to be greatly expanded, and that means we must start now to train the scholars who will become part of those faculties.

Our problem will go far beyond that of capital improvements to the college plant, and manpower expansion in the faculty. Many young men and women from families in the lower income brackets will strive for the opportunity to enter colleges, posing these questions:

How can we make it possible for the brainpower of these young people to be utilized for the Nation's good? How can we make it possible for colleges, junior colleges, and technical schools of our country to expand and serve all of the scholars who are knocking at their doors?

It has become more and more the custom, in the past few years, to look to the Federal Government to solve such problems. Federal grants have become the panacea for all our ills.

But together with such Federal paternalism must go Federal control. Higher education must yield some part of its autonomy when it depends upon Federal handouts.

Localities must give up their home rule prerogatives.

How much better it would be, how much more in keeping with the principles of American free enterprise, to devise a way in which the private sector of the economy could provide the funds to make it possible for our colleges and universities to expand and serve the growing demand from the youth of America.

How much better it would be if every child in America could look forward to at least a basic nest egg on which he can focus his hopes for future higher education.

A plan which can accomplish just that was outlined in this House not long ago by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGLER]. He called it the Iowa plan, in deference to its State of origin.

It is a great plan—so great, that it could very well be called the American plan. Today, I have introduced a bill to put a large part of that plan into operation. Later, I know, Mr. SCHWENGLER will introduce additional legislation to clarify some aspects of the plan, and to add to it.

Briefly, the plan involves a program under which parents would purchase educational investment certificates to provide at least part of the funds to make it possible for their children to attend institutions of higher learning.

A parent could purchase one \$50 educational certificate each year of a child's life, until the child reaches the age of 18—the usual age for college entrance.

For each \$50 certificate purchased in this way, the parent would be entitled to a \$50 deduction from his annual income tax. For example, a parent buying three \$50 bonds for three children, might have a total income tax liability of \$600 in that year, but he would have to pay only \$450.

In cases of lower income families, some parents may not have enough tax liability at the end of a year to make it possible to take advantage of a full \$50 credit for each child. In that case, a grandparent, an uncle, or another rela-

tive could buy a certificate, and he, too, would be entitled to a \$50 deduction.

If no relative can buy certificates, a friend designated by the parents can assume the responsibility. It would be no burden at all, because each \$50 certificate would entitle the purchaser to a \$50 tax rebate.

If a certificate is purchased each year of a child's life until he is 18, the accumulated funds, with interest added, would amount to about \$1,400 at college entrance age.

After the young student has entered college, his parent would be entitled to an additional tax deduction of \$100 a year during the 4 college years, providing \$400 more—or \$1,800 in all—to help pay the costs of tuition, books, fees, and educational material.

Educational investment certificates would be sold by banks, savings and loan institutions and insurance companies approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or his designated representative.

The educational investment certificate program would accumulate \$25 billion in the private sector of the economy to help expand higher education facilities. That would be money distributed and used without Federal controls. It would be money put to the best use by those who know best how to do the job—the educators themselves.

At the same time, such a program would give many Americans an opportunity to become shareholders in the Nation's future, and would offer opportunities to many deserving young men and women who might not otherwise manage to get to college.

Under this plan, there should be no reason why each young man and young woman capable of college study should not find a nest egg waiting to help him toward higher education when the time comes.

Estimates place the annual cost of tax credits under this program at approximately \$2.6 billion, but that would not be the net cost. Many present Federal-aid programs would no longer be necessary, and that would reduce the cost.

Let us not forget that we grant investment tax credits as a spur to the economy, and the cost to the Government in 1967 is estimated at about \$2.6 billion. Certainly, we can afford an equal amount for stimulation investment in our future scientists, mathematicians and teachers.

L. B. J.'S ORDER FREED LORAIN DOPE BOSS: JUDGE OBJECTED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this heading appeared in the Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer on Tuesday, July 4, 1967, "L. B. J.'s Order Freed Lorain Dope Boss: Judge Objected."

Today, I have called upon the Justice Department to release information regarding the questionable circumstances surrounding the surprising and unwarranted release of an Ohio hoodlum, Johnny Gay, who got out of custody by

order of the President of the United States.

As the article in the Cleveland paper stated:

Nearly everyone in Northern Ohio knows him (Johnny Gay) from the cops to the Costa Nostra.

Gay was a big narcotics pusher. In 1962, Federal agents described him as the "largest source of heroin in the State of Ohio." They said he was in the narcotic business as a wholesaler.

U.S. District Judge James C. Connell, an eminent jurist, the sentencing judge, said:

Gay for reasons of his own chose to live a life spiced up with crime, narcotics, prostitution, bigamy and whatever degrading thrills he was susceptible of absorbing, over a long period of time, and with malice aforethought every day involved.

Judge Connell ordered Gay imprisoned until 1972 but today this hoodlum is free. It cannot be doubted that "someone up there—Washington—likes him." The President has the obligation, I believe, to tell us what considerations prompted Gay's early release despite the objection of the U.S. judge who best knew the facts of the case.

The commutation was granted over the objection of Judge Connell and the U.S. attorney's office in Cleveland, Ohio. What particular political pressure was Gay able to bring to bear? What well-placed attorneys were able to wrought this miracle—or should it be called a travesty of justice? The eyes of the Nation have been on the Congress and the alleged wrongdoing of Members of the House and Senate. Would this case stand the same light of day as was shone on Senator Dodd?

The people, yes, and we in the U.S. Congress, have a right to know what magic Gay seemed to have. He did not even qualify for the usual requirements for release—namely, a job. He has been unemployed 4 of the approximately 6 months he has been out of Federal custody.

Something smells very bad. Johnny Gay has in his possession a document bearing Lyndon B. Johnson's name. A U.S. judge, those charged with the administration of justice, Congressmen, and the public have a right to know just how it got there. Will you tell us, Mr. President?

The articles from the Cleveland Plain Dealer are most illuminating on this subject. I include them at this point:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 4, 1967]

L. B. J.'S ORDER FREED LORAIN DOPE BOSS: JUDGE OBJECTED

(By Doris O'Donnell and Harry Stainer)

LORAIN.—Johnny Gay is back in town.

Nearly everyone in Northern Ohio knows him—from the cops to the Costa Nostra.

Before he was sent to prison, he was a big narcotics pusher. In 1962, federal narcotics agents described him as "the largest source of heroin in the State of Ohio." They said he was "in the narcotic business as a wholesaler."

U.S. District Judge James C. Connell, the sentencing judge, said in 1962: "... Gay for reasons of his own chose to live a life spiced up with crime, narcotics, prostitution, bigamy, and whatever degrading thrills

he was susceptible of absorbing, over a long period of time, and with malice aforethought every day involved."

He ordered Gay imprisoned until 1972.

Today Gay is free.

Today Gay is a big man with a presidential commutation that helped cut his prison term in half.

The commutation was granted over the objection of Judge Connell and the U.S. attorney's office here.

What magic got him out while others remain in prison without friends, without influence? Why and how did people prominent in social, civic and police circles in Lorain back his release in writing?

To find out The Plain Dealer assigned two reporters to crash through the curtain of bureaucracy, to talk with people on Broadway, Vine Street, Dallas Avenue and in the "campito," a mixed Negro-white-Puerto Rican community in Sheffield Township.

They came up with a story bigger than Johnny Gay.

It is the story of a city.

The Johnny Gay who bolted to freedom more than five months ago by executive clemency of the president of the United States once owned a bar in downtown Lorain, called Johnny's Bar. It was a black and tan honky-tonk hangout for action and action people—booze, girls, numbers, narcotics.

Until forces of Cleveland and Detroit police, federal narcotic agents and Coast Guard intelligence men moved in on Gay in 1962, Gay operated high, wide and handsome. Lorain law enforcement people were conspicuously absent in the raid that bagged Gay as a narcotic pusher.

In 1956 Gay beat a marijuana charge. But a Negro bootlegger and friend of Gay's, Mrs. Zetta Brown, caught in the same illegal marijuana trap, served 10 years in a state prison. She was paroled a few days ago from Marysville, O., Reformatory for Women.

In 1962, Gay's luck was bad.

Doors of the federal hospital-prison for narcotic addicts at Lexington, Ky., closed on him July 11, 1962.

Only days before, Judge Connell doled out two five-year sentences to run consecutively.

No parole was to cut the sentence, Judge Connell said. When he went to Lexington, Gay was 45, fat and paunchy. About 215 pounds, Balding.

At age 49, he had served four years, six months, two weeks of his prison term.

Doors flew open for him Jan. 20. Out strode Johnny Gay, trimmer and thinner, with a piece of paper signed by Nicholas D. Katzenbach, former U.S. attorney general and now a U.S. undersecretary of state.

Lyndon B. Johnson's name appears twice in bold, black, block letters. The paper shows that executive clemency was granted June 9, 1966. Probation will be up Jan. 1, 1969.

The Department of Justice has rules governing applications from any federal prisoner for executive clemency. One covers pardons. One covers commutations or reduction of prison terms.

The eligibility rule for a commutation is: "A petition for commutation of sentence, including remission of fine, should be filed only if no other form of relief is available, such as from the court or the United States Board of Parole, or if unusual circumstances exist, such as critical illness, severity of sentence, ineligibility for parole, or meritorious service rendered by the petitioner."

The attorney general's office reviews all such petitions, and then the attorney general advises the president whether the request is warranted.

"Whenever a President notifies the attorney general that he is denying a request for clemency," the rules state, "the attorney general or the pardon attorney, shall so advise the petitioner and close the case."

Gay said in his petition that his father, a stroke victim, was dying, that his 10-year

sentence was unfair and that his record at Lexington had won the praise of the staff. He said appeals to the district court had failed.

Gay's presidential commutation, according to Reed Cozart, U.S. pardon attorney, was based on an evaluation that Gay's sentence was "disparate." His two five-year terms, or 10 consecutive years, were, Cozart said, "disparate" in the national picture for first offenders. Most narcotic violators serve the maximum of five years.

Gay's 10-year term was knocked down to seven years.

His term was further reduced to four years, six months and 20 days by virtue of "good time" earned at Lexington.

Statutory and meritorious good time earned by Gay at the prison-hospital amounted to 1,328 days.

A statutory credit is "good time" earned by prisoners who work in production or industrial programs.

Gay was not engaged in these areas but still received staff review board credits for work he actually did.

Meritorious credit is for "acts of heroism" or comparable endeavors. Gay earned his for "extraordinary" performances at Lexington, based on opinions of staff doctors who either worked with him or observed his conduct and actions.

Presidential commutations are a rarity in the Cleveland area. Few law enforcement agents can recall another like the Gay case.

Even Cozart could not name another Ohioan who had received executive clemency in recent years.

During the Eisenhower administration, a Justice Department spokesman said, there were 1,157 presidential pardons and commutations. Under the late President Kennedy, there were 575 in a three-year period. But in 12 months, President Johnson has approved 566, nearly as many as Kennedy did in three years. President Johnson has granted 420 pardons, and 146 commutations, such as Gay's.

One highly placed federal official said: "There are more of them all the time. They always go to the worst ones. The criminal element gets to the politician."

But Cozart denies that any kind of political or other influence figured in Gay's release or any other. He cited the case of Jake (The Barber) Factor, a West Coast figure who reportedly contributed to President Johnson's campaign fund from behind bars. This delayed clemency. When freed, Factor told newsmen he gave an identical sum to U.S. Sen. Barry Goldwater, at the time a presidential candidate.

It is not impossible to tell the story of Gay's commutation without looking back into Gay's career.

It is like dropping a rock in a pond. Ripples widen and widen.

Ripples spread from Gay into the city, to persons in all walks of life. Many lives have intertwined with Gay's.

Gay was arrested April 30, 1962, after an exhaustive investigation lasting more than six months.

Since 1960, tipsters had been telling police and federal agents of weekly purchases of narcotics at Gay's place of business.

Arrested with Gay were Curtis Orr, then 33, and his sister, Virginia Orr, then 25, Miss Orr was Gay's barmaid.

From March 1, 1962, until the arrests, federal agents contended, Gay and the Orrs illegally bought, sold and transported heroin. The trio, singly or in pairs, made flying trips to Chicago and New York. The three were charged with a total of 21 counts, or separate offenses. Gay alone had 18 counts.

The charges in Gay's indictment state he bought, sold and transported 10.06 grams of heroin. He sold 10.02 grams to a narcotics agent on March 11, 1962, and 0.04 grams on April 30.

With Orr, Gay bought and sold 28.54 grams to federal agents, and Gay and Miss Orr illegally sold 9.88 grams of heroin to agents. For all purchases, two agents paid \$1,375.

Gay pleaded innocent to 18 counts. Faced with a possible prison term of 90 years, he changed to a guilty plea on six counts. The other 12 were dropped.

Gay pleaded guilty—along with Curtis Orr—to selling 9.88 grams—about one-third ounce—of heroin to federal narcotic agent Arthur Lewis and another special government agent March 17, 1962. He also pleaded guilty to selling, again with Orr, 14.62 grams to Lewis and another agent March 27, 1962.

Later, in motions to reopen his case, Gay claimed he did not understand how he was pleading because he was incompetent due to the use of drugs.

At Gay's trial, his attorney, John P. Butler, Cleveland criminal lawyer, told the court: "... I realize that the charge is very serious. Nothing could make me more conscious of that fact. I do not mitigate the seriousness of the charge."

"He had a distinguished record of service to the government and while in service in the Merchant Marine, on one occasion, he was torpedoed. He suffered from shock . . . I realize that serving the government under elements of peril may not justify the use of narcotics but this is his explanation for his original involvement."

The judge was not deterred. Three sentences, each of five years, he held should run concurrently. On three other five year terms, he again ruled a concurrent course. But the two sets were to be consecutive.

"So it will be 10 years in the custody of the attorney general," Judge Connell said.

(Heroin is a drug made from morphine. Morphine, in turn, is a drug made from opium. Both are addictive drugs. Gay reportedly was selling "cut" heroin as opposed to "pure" heroin.)

(Records show that at the time of Gay's arrest federal narcotics agents found Beta Lactose milk sugar, which is used to "cut" or dilute heroin for resale. They confiscated, too, a wire screen strainer used to sift heroin in the cutting process for resale.)

Curtis Orr received a total of six years on three counts. Miss Orr received two years, or two two-year terms, running concurrently. She served her term at Lexington too. Paroled in 1963, she returned there voluntarily for treatment on a voluntary basis for five months. Gay bigamously married Miss Orr in Chicago on August 23, 1960.

In a written document later denying Gay's plea that he was a pauper and wanted a new trial without counsel, Judge Connell wrote:

"Gay made a drug addict out of this young colored girl (Miss Orr) when he made her his agent for buying and selling drugs, and then married her in Chicago, and lived with her in rooms above his dope den. He fooled her into believing he was divorced."

Miss Orr, now off parole, lives in downtown Lorain and it is an open secret, say Miss Orr's friends, that she and Johnny Gay have broken up. But they still communicate with each other, and neighbors of Miss Orr's have frequently seen Gay's car parked in front of her Broadway apartment.

Relatives of Miss Orr told reporters that when she returned to Lexington for treatment she gave her marriage certificate to Gay, who has never returned it.

Mention of Johnny Gay in Lorain always raises the question of whether he was an addict.

And why he served all of his term at Lexington instead of a federal maximum security prison. (One advantage of a regular prison is that prisoners earn money for working. At Lexington, Gay did not earn any money.)

And how he happened to get the presidential mandatory release.

Some people stare in disbelief when it is mentioned.

Lorain Mayor Woodrow Mathna said: "That takes a lot of pull, a lot of influence. I have an idea who got it for him."

Lon. B. Adams, a Lorain lawyer, was Gay's first lawyer of record following his 1962 arrest. He recalled that Gay was held briefly in Cuyahoga County Jail. He was released on \$25,000 surety bond, for which Gay's wife pledged their home, valued at \$35,000 with \$15,000 mortgage, and the bar property, valued at \$55,000 with a \$20,000 mortgage. The Orrs could not make bail and were held in jail.

On May 4, four days after his arrest, Gay was admitted voluntarily to Hanna Pavilion of University Hospital, Adams said, for "psychiatric treatment." Gay remained until May 19. The diagnosis of his condition was "suspected narcotic addict."

The court record quotes from a federal probation department report on Gay's condition requested by the probation officer from Dr. James W. Jolliff, psychiatric resident at Hanna Pavilion:

"Dr. Jolliff stated that the defendant did not experience any withdrawal symptoms and that the diagnosis would therefore have to continue the term 'suspected' since it was based entirely on the defendant's statement of a history of drug addiction."

"Dr. Jolliff stated that the defendant gave no evidence of psychosis or any major mental disorder and appeared to be experiencing a personality disorder that was not uncommon in the case of individuals who had just been arrested for a major law violation."

The doctor said Gay remained longer than necessary because Gay "stated that he was experiencing suicidal tendencies . . ."

Judge Connell ordered Gay to Lexington for treatment as an addict and then to be transferred to a prison.

Lexington, begun back in the mid-1930s, was known as Lexington Farm for Narcotic Addicts. Many famous stage, movie and athletic stars have been voluntary patients there. It later became the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital. Today it is the National Mental Health Institute Research Center. Even those afflicted with the hospital admit more failures than successes among patients.

A pre-sentence report, detailing Gay's background, was available to Judge Connell, and also to Washington officials who handled his commutation request.

In this, Gay admitted using morphine off and on from 1943 to 1958. After 1958, Gay said he used it more frequently. He said he was worried over his investment in a low-income housing development in East Lorain.

Dr. Jimmie D. Hawthorne, a U.S. Public Health Service officer at Lexington, where he is second in command, said whether Gay was a heroin user was dependent entirely on "Gay's story."

He said Form N-62 was submitted with Gay's pre-sentence report from Cleveland. No medical examination records were attached.

The form read: "I, Gerald Celebrezze (then an assistant U.S. attorney) hereby certify that it is my belief that such a convicted person is an addict within the meaning of the law and authority that established the U.S. Narcotics Farm."

GAY TRIED HAND AS LAWYER, BUT JUDGE KO'D HIS APPEAL

A year after Johnny Gay was sentenced to a 10-year sentence for illegal sale, possession and concealment of narcotics, he tried unsuccessfully to appeal.

From the federal hospital for narcotics addicts at Lexington, Ky., he sent self-authored legal pleas to U.S. District Judge James C. Connell in July, 1963. He was broke, he wrote. He asked the court to hear his petition without counsel.

The judge viewed Gay's request and commented:

"Since his requests are ambiguous, this court will consider this filing as in the nature of a motion to vacate sentence, on the ground that he claims he was not mentally competent on his plea."

"We will consider it as in the nature of the suggestion that Gay says he did not know what he was doing when he pleaded guilty to the various charges against him at the time and consider this as a motion that his plea of guilty be vacated."

The judge questioned Gay's claim that a psychiatric hospital "saw fit" to hold him for three weeks. A doctor's report, the judge noted, said Gay remained voluntarily because he had suicidal tendencies.

The judge observed: "So, immediately after Gay was arrested for his busy life of crime, he voluntarily tried a hospital escape and it did not succeed."

"And from the above report, it was very proper that it failed," the judge added. "And the foregoing amply demonstrates that Gay's first claim that he was so influenced by drugs during his crimes that he did not understand what was going on, and that he was too unable to comprehend his own plea of guilty, is another untenable fabrication."

Connell included major portions of the probation officer's report in his order denying Gay a new trial on a pauper's plea in July, 1963.

The probation report stated:

"The defendant has an extremely unsavory personal reputation in the city of Lorain. This reputation is derived from the manner in which he has operated his nightclub since he purchased it in 1956."

"There is a feeling in the community that the defendant has operated a ring of prostitutes at his club. The county welfare department director advised the probation officers that in the past several years girls have come to his department for assistance stating that they had been prostitutes and that when they became pregnant, they were put out on the street."

"According to the welfare director, these girls identified themselves as 'Johnny Gay's girls.'"

"However, police authorities in Lorain advised the probation officer that they never had reason to believe that this defendant was personally involved in any prostitution ring."

"They were of the opinion that he permitted prostitutes to solicit openly at his club and for years the club has had the reputation of being the place to go to get a woman."

"The defendant, when questioned by the probation officer regarding prostitution occurring at the club, denied any personal involvement with prostitution. However, he admitted that prostitutes did solicit at his club and that he permitted this activity because to stop it would 'ruin his business.'"

"The defendant was apparently more concerned with making money than he was with his personal reputation or the reputation of his place of business."

Connell then drew a conclusion:

"This Court considers that his claim of not having conscious control of himself during his 'crimes,' of not understanding his lawyer, of not being fairly treated and of being irresponsible for his actions, is a most frivolous and malicious fabrication. The motion in forma pauperis is dismissed as frivolous and malicious."

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 6, 1967]

JOHNNY GAY WOOS STAFF: TERM CUT BY 1,328 DAYS

(By Doris O'Donnell and Harry Stainer)

At Lexington, Ky., where the National Mental Health Institute Research Center now operates facilities for drug addicts, Gay became No. 66862.

The tattooed ex-Marine and bar owner became something else, too, a veritable wonder to the hospital staff.

He was there to serve 10 years for numerous violations of federal narcotic laws.

But he could not envision himself stuck in prison for that long. He was 45. He wanted out.

Many prisoners become jailhouse lawyers. Gay went this route, too, using the hospital library for legal research.

He bombarded U.S. District Judge James C. Connell, who had sentenced him in 1962, with legal requests to appeal the conviction and sentence. He had only 10 cents to his name, he said, and wanted the court to hear his petition without counsel.

Gay charged a miscarriage of justice. He charged he was incompetent at the time he pleaded guilty to 18 narcotics charges. He charged his lawyer "took advantage of his incompetence" and promised he would get a five-year sentence and parole. Judge Connell here denied each motion.

Judge Connell used remarkable language in denying Gay's appeal. The judge wrote:

"One can learn something of the mental capacity of a defendant by the way he goes about the business of committing an offense. Of what did Gay's crimes consist? He was in the criminal business which requires more cunning and ingenuity than most others, and he brought to it more cunning than others."

"He was in the business of successfully buying narcotics; finding the sellers; using dupes to make the purchases; then finding the buyers; transmitting to buyers on a successful financial basis and scale; successfully selling only to those he can trust; successfully selling only to known addicts; successfully avoiding sales to government agents."

"No one could possibly have worked up the lucrative business he enjoyed, and at the same time have been so mentally incompetent that he didn't know what was going on around him, or what he said to others, or what they said to him."

He added: "The agents had no easy time with Gay, for Gay brought unusual intelligence, daring, perception and generalship to his nefarious business."

But Gay was not easily deterred.

Gay wrote probation officials. He appealed to the Legal Aid Society in Lexington. He was shooting unerringly at a target—freedom.

Printed application forms for executive clemency are available to all federal prisoners. At Lexington few inmates—only six to eight of about 700—might take advantage of them.

Gay not only took advantage of them, he directed his father, John Gay, a retired steelworker, to get signatures of friends and relatives. Gay wrote a long autobiography, not sparing intimate details of his life, to support his application.

Reed Cozart, U.S. pardon attorney, evaluated the Gay written document, with 14 signatures of friends from Lorain, Cleveland and Lexington as particularly candid. Gay discussed his interracial and bigamous marriage to a former barmaid, Virginia Orr. Cozart was convinced Gay wasn't trying to hide anything.

The Plain Dealer learned who signed the petitions. Names of letter writers were not made available by federal officials.

While the commutation machinery was grinding slowly through the U.S. Justice Department, Gay did not sit around and hope or pray. He had another angle or two. It was to earn time off his sentence by his behaviour at the Lexington hospital.

Dr. Jimmie D. Hawthorne, M.D. assistant to Dr. Robert Raser, director of the Lexington hospital recalled Gay came to Lexington's Cobb Hall in 1962 in a state of "depression." Once improved, he was given a clerical job

with the staff that handled psychological testing of inmates. Dr. Hawthorne stressed that Gay did not administer tests. He gathered the papers, prepared them for evaluation. Paper shuffling, really.

"He also called the machinery on the call system," Dr. Hawthorne said.

The call system involves getting patients safely from security quarters to interview offices for appointments with staff, clergy or visitors.

"Our biggest problem has been separating men from women, preventing them from stopping off en route to appointments or turning up missing at some point along the way," the doctor said.

Before Gay, there were problems of this kind with inmates.

After Gay, none, Dr. Hawthorne said.

A greenhouse had been abandoned. (Dr. Hawthorne explained Lexington officials had discarded an old concept that narcotic addicts needed fresh air and farm work as forms of treatment. The hospital is on 1,000 acres of rolling Kentucky landscape, and farm animals once roamed its blue grass.)

But Gay, "as a voluntary thing," revived the greenhouse greenery.

"While here he was a model patient," Dr. Hawthorne said. "He planted the inner court—turned it into a horticultural garden. He and a professor of romance languages at the University of Kentucky had much in common with the garden."

The professor taught English to Spanish-speaking patients. Gay accompanied the professor into the city of Lexington on occasion.

Gay was an Episcopalian as a youth. At Lexington, he switched to Catholicism. He wrote a booklet on the changes in the liturgy of the mass. He directed incoming patients, who were Catholic, to the chaplain. The Protestant chaplain tried to recruit Gay, too.

The Catholic priest, in exchange, wrote letters of appeal on Gay's behalf, to U.S. Senators Frank J. Lausche and Stephen M. Young of Ohio. He also wrote to U.S. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, N.Y. Gay said each senator replied that the matter was under investigation by the Justice Department.

Gay's good deeds did not go unnoticed. It earned him time off his sentence. His file is filled with reports by the hospital review staff. Gay was also a guinea pig for the hospital's research project and had an opportunity for post-graduate work in the newer drugs, including LSD.

At Lexington, the U.S. Public Health Service tests drugs, real and synthetic, to learn if they are addictive and "safe" for mass consumption.

During July and August, 1965, Gay took part in four psychological studies—one was a reaction of skin to heat. None, Dr. Hawthorne said, required Gay to take any form of opiate drug.

Dr. Hawthorne said Gay got "lump sums" of good time for his "meritorious performance on a high level," as determined by the staff review board. Normally, Dr. Hawthorne said, this is reserved for "acts of heroism." He cited a person who rescued trapped patients from a stuck elevator.

"But Gay had sustained superior performances over and above what was expected," he said. "When a clerk was off he performed the clerk's duties for three months."

On Dec. 24, 1966, Gay received a furlough. He went to his parent's trailer home at 3948 Reid Avenue, Lorain, where his father was stricken. Earlier the father had suffered a stroke. Gay went unescorted under new rules of Lexington. Persons who saw Gay in Lorain last Christmas were dumb-founded.

Why was Gay kept at the hospital. Why wasn't he transferred to a security prison where drug racketeers usually go?

"At no time," Dr. Hawthorne said, "did the hospital staff feel that we had done all we could for Gay. He continued to fight his

legal battle. He was upset. He had letters from his family (two daughters) which upset him. We felt that 4½ years—his stay at Lexington—was short. He needed to be here.

"He left here not dependent on any drug. He had a great deal of psychology treatment and benefited from it, but whether it will sustain him—?"

In Washington, Gay's No. G-80 document, the appeal for presidential clemency, with signature of family and friends was fortified with dozens of letters. Cozart handled all of them. He is a veteran of 25 years in penal work. He was one-time deputy warden of the federal prison at Leavenworth, Kan.

The progress report from Kentucky, March 4, 1966, Cozart said, stated that Gay "had been an addict for many years and was now cured."

HERE ARE CONDITIONS OF GAY'S FREEDOM

The Cleveland office of the U.S. Board of Parole provided The Plain Dealer with a list, detailing conditions for a federal parole.

John A. Gay, while free on a mandatory release by virtue of executive clemency, is under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland parole office. The area includes northern Ohio, and extends south to Mansfield, O., where Gay is now employed.

The rules are that a parolee may not leave the limits of the district without permission of the parole officer.

The conditions also prohibit drinking alcohol to excess, the purchase, possession or use of narcotics or other habit-forming drugs and avoiding places where drugs are illegally sold or used.

Parolees also may not associate with persons who have a criminal record or associate with persons engaged in criminal activity.

Firearms are forbidden without written permission.

In addition, a parolee may not act as an informer or special agent for any law-enforcement agency.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 7, 1967]

GAY JOBLESS 4 MONTHS—LIVED OFF HIS OLD IOU'S

(By Doris O'Donnell and Harry Stainer)

LORAIN.—It isn't every day that a felon gets a presidential commutation and walks out of federal custody into freedom.

John A. Gay did.

With the precious document bearing Lyndon B. Johnson's name, Gay was supposed to have a plan—a home, a job, a way of life within the law.

The hard-won presidential document travels with Gay, the former Lorain narcotics pusher. He keeps it in a shoebox in the trunk of his father's car, which he now drives.

Gay was released from the federal hospital for narcotics addicts at Lexington, Ky., last Jan. 20. But it was May 2 before he went to work on his first job in Mansfield, O., as a salesman for Majestic Homes, a real estate development. He told his employer he had been in a clinical research hospital. He stayed at the Mansfield YMCA. He and the job parted company a few days ago.

From January until May, he had numerous problems, but no job. His father, John A. Gay Sr., was in a nursing home, the victim of a stroke. His aged mother, Mrs. Lillie Gay, was unable to drive the family car. Gay took her to and from the nursing home daily.

Plain Dealer reporters checked Gay's activities with the federal parole office in Cleveland.

"That's a ticklish one," an officer there said. "He's supposed to have a job. That's a condition of the release. He's come up with several plans. He wanted to go to Chicago,

then Philadelphia. And to Thailand. But none of his plans were realistic."

Michael J. Keenan, Gay's probation officer, explained that under a mandatory presidential release, such as Gay's, Justice Department reviewers apparently considered that Gay, a divorced man, "had a home with his mother, could depend upon her for sustenance and that the regular requirements for employment could be waived."

Gay came out of the hospital-prison with two suits of clothes given him by a former brother-in-law, Frank J. Nardini, 3330 E. Erie Street, Lorain. Nardini is board chairman of Lorain, Inc., an \$11-million real estate holding company.

Nardini and his wife, Laura Dandrea Nardini, while driving to Florida last January dropped off the suits when they visited Gay at Lexington.

Gay barely had cigarette money.

Barnmaids and tavern owners along Broadway in Lorain say Gay has been collecting on old IOU's the last four years. One businessman with a reputation for losing heavily at gambling is reportedly repaying Gay money loaned him before Gay went to prison.

Gay at that time said his outstanding debts totaled \$25,000.

Gay told reporters that his former wife, now in Florida, returned IOU's to him which she was unable to collect.

Reed Cozart, U.S. pardon attorney, told a Plain Dealer reporter that the U.S. Bureau of Prison's report on Gay showed "he had reestablished contact with his wife and family and they (the bureau) gave him good credit there."

This facet of Gay's commutation record bears scrutiny.

His daughters are married. One lives in Philadelphia, the other in Chicago.

His wife, Mrs. Dorothy Dandrea Gay, divorced him in December, 1962, about six months after Gay landed in the addict hospital in Lexington.

The Gays were married March 8, 1940, at Napoleon, O. Mrs. Gay filed for divorce May 18, 1962, less than three weeks after Gay's arrest for narcotics.

When she filed for divorce, she was awarded temporary alimony and custody of one minor daughter. She received a restraining order to prevent Gay from selling his property, which included an apartment house at 7520 Everett Court N.E. here.

Her lawyer, Joseph A. Ujhelyi, all the time noted that "she is fearful he will dissipate" his property.

Mrs. Gay has since remarried. She is Mrs. John Ferracane, 2625 N. Andrews Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Her husband runs a bakery and restaurant there.

Gay's own family—his mother, and a brother, George Lewis Gay—termed the divorce "an agreement" between the Gays. One Lorain lawyer called it a "phony divorce."

Expectations were that the Gays would be reunited when he was free and that his property meanwhile, would remain in his control indirectly.

A police source said the divorce was to enable Mrs. Gay to keep the liquor license for Gay's tavern in her name.

Gay, as a convicted felon, would not be able to hold a permit. But on June 21, 1962, while Gay was out on bail awaiting trial, a state liquor agent showed up at his tavern, Johnny's Bar, demanding the license. It had been revoked.

Gay did not have to check Lorain County courthouse records to see where his property went while he was away. It was gone. It had passed from his wife's hands to her brother's, and then to a Lorain policeman, a long-time friend of Gay's.

Gay's Bar and other properties went through an involved series of transfers after his sentencing which, reliable informants told The Plain Dealer, were designed to hold them in a sort of "safe-keeping" for Gay

when he became free. But it did not work out that way in each case.

Gay's business and moneymaking career began after World War II. He and John Mariotta formed Associated Builders Supply Co., Inc. Then Gay decided to go into business for himself. He had been working with his brother's wife, John Dandrea, and Nardini in Associated Builders and the construction business run by Dandrea and Nardini.

He sold his interest in Associated Builders and bought old Rebman's Recreation at 1038-40 Broadway for \$105,000 with \$30,000 in cash down. He ran it as Johnny's Bar.

On May 15, 1962, before Gay's trial in July and his conviction, followed by the divorce, he quit-claimed title to his wife on three lots on Falbo Avenue, where his \$35,000 home was located.

There was a \$23,000 mortgage with the Lorain National Bank on March 6, 1962. It was paid off on May 17, 1965.

Mrs. Gay, in 1963, mortgaged the three lots plus two others on Broadway to Ben Hart, a Broadway tavern owner, who later was shot to death. The price: \$34,534. She took another \$7,500 mortgage on the three Falbo Avenue lots, paying it off on May 14, 1965.

On May 11, 1965, Mrs. Gay—listed as unmarried on court documents—then deeded sublots 73, 74 and 75 on Falbo Avenue to Peter and Juanita D'Agnese. Tax stamps totaled \$38.50. Taxes are \$1.10 per thousand evaluation, indicating a \$35,000 transaction.

D'Agnese, former owner of the Lorain Broadway Lumber & Materials Co., runs a bar at 651 Broadway, which Gay's daughter and son-in-law once ran.

Also back on May 15, 1962, Gay quit-claimed title to sublots 8 and 9—his bar property at 1038-40 Broadway—to his wife.

Lawyer Ujhelyi, longtime chairman of the Lorain County Democratic organization, did not transfer this deed for nearly three years—or until May 11, 1965.

Records show that Mrs. Gay, on March 15, 1965, deeded the bar property—which was occupied then by another bar to her brother, John Dandrea Jr., 219 Missouri Avenue, Lorain.

Dandrea is vice president of Associated Builders, Inc., secretary-treasurer of Lorain Trucking Co., Inc., half-million dollar shareholder and director of Lorain, Inc. and a principal in American Dock & Dredge Corp. There were no stamps on this transaction between brother and sister.

On March 26, 1965, Dandrea took a \$25,000 mortgage on 1040 Broadway from Central Securities National Bank of which another brother-in-law, Nardini, is a director. It was released Nov. 24, 1965.

Dandrea sold this property to John Kochan on Nov. 22, 1965. Tax stamps total \$34.10. Central Securities National Bank holds a \$20,000 mortgage on Kochan. It is a 12-year note payable at \$200 a month.

Kochan, 3565 Toledo Avenue, has been a Lorain patrolman 21 years. Kochan and Lorain Police Sergeant Richard L. Griffith were acquitted in 1964 of beating a confession from 18-year-old Angelo Morales. Their trial was in U.S. district court here.

Kochan said his father, a retired steelworker, put up the money for the bar property. Kochan said a friend, Miss Margaret Dziana, rents from him. She is the liquor permit holder of the Tally-Ho Bar, 1040 Broadway.

Kochan answered when reporters called the bar.

Johnny Gay, since his release from prison, said he hangs out at places run by old friends. One is the Picadilly on Broadway, the other is Kochan's place which Gay calls "Johnny's place."

"Might as well give them the business," Gay said.

Reporters asked a Lorain vice squad officer whether Gay has been in old hangouts. He

said he saw Gay in two Broadway night spots in recent weeks.

Another police officer said he heard Gay was an informer for the federal government and that he's "bound to be trouble."

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 9, 1967]

GAY DEFENDS RELEASE BY "COURT OF LAST APPEAL"

(By Doris O'Donnell and Harry Stainer)

LORAIN.—John Alfred Gay said the federal government put him in prison and that it also was "the court of last appeal" to get him out.

"I was given a sentence over the minimum," he insisted, "and there had been no chance for probation or parole. A presidential commutation was the court of last appeal."

Gay was sentenced to two five-year terms for illegal purchase, sale and concealment of narcotics. The terms were to run consecutively. The maximum sentence for federal narcotics violations is five years per count. With time off for good behavior, a narcotics convict can be freed in less than five years.

Gay, by a presidential order, had his sentence commuted to seven years. This was further cut by time off for good behavior. He was released in 4½ years.

Gay spent three hours with Plain Dealer reporters recently. He answered questions freely, smiled, smoked. He was pleasant, almost charming. He made no bones about disliking publicity.

"If something comes up about me in the newspapers," he said, "I'll relocate. I'd give my commutation back to the President if you print anything about it and me."

Gay sat in the shadow of his parents' mobile home at 3948 Reid Avenue, Lorain. He held a yellow legal pad on his lap, but he wrote nothing on it.

He explained that "social service workers at Lexington" told him of the commutation forms in 1964 and that he began preparing them. He had already tried to pry the hospital doors open with the assistance of Cleveland lawyer John P. Butler and failed. Next he tried the Legal Aid Society of the University of Kentucky.

"An offshoot of my interest in the commutation," Gay said, "was that immediately after sending my petition in, I helped a man named Taylor, an illiterate from New York. We both got seven-year commuted sentences, and we both got out the same time."

Gay said he was investigated for two years by the U.S. Justice Department.

Nathaniel R. Jones, an assistant U.S. Attorney here, said that on Jan. 18, 1965, the U.S. pardon attorney notified the U.S. attorney's office here that the Gay case was under consideration. The Gay file was sent here and reviewed. Jones then wrote the following letter to the pardon attorney, Reed Cozart.

"The seriousness of the offences committed and the period of time over which they were committed, compels this office to the belief that a reduction in sentence at this early date is not warranted, Judge Connell (James C.) concurs in this view."

Jones said the Gay file was returned to Washington in March, 1965, and "we heard nothing more until we were notified of the commutation in June, 1966."

These reporters asked Gay if he was a narcotic addict, and if so, whether his assignment to Lexington was based on his own statements about using drugs.

"It was based on my own statements pretty much," Gay said. He explained that after his arrest in 1962, he was not given either a medical or psychiatric examination by the federal court.

"I was a heroin addict," he said, "and for this I received intensive psychotherapy."

Looking back at his preprison life, Gay said:

"I was unstable, I led a dual life. Now, I know where I want to head. I want happiness and contentment. I want to be out of the public eye."

Gay, an ex-Marine, who was also the master on a tanker in the Merchant Marine, said he started taking morphine while in military service.

Why? "The result of being scared." He saw service in the Mediterranean Sea, the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf and the Sea of Japan.

After the war, he said he and John Mariotta started Associated Builders, Inc., in Lorain and later lined up with his two brothers-in-law, John Dandrea and Frank J. Nardini, in Dandrea & Nardini.

"I wanted to try to run my own business," he said. "Rebman's (recreation and bowling) looked like a terrifically good business venture. I sold my interest in Associated Builders and bought the place."

Nardini had said Gay's interest in Associated Builders was around \$20,000 but Gay said: "I had more than that coming."

Gay then ventured into the home construction business, operating Dixie Construction Co. along with his Broadway tavern.

Gay said it was during this period that he began using drugs often. "I used to get morphine from a doctor here in Lorain," he said. "He's dead now."

Gay said that a John S. a Cleveland Negro, "had connections" for getting heroin.

"I was buying for my own use," Gay said. John S. brought in the federal agent. In my case, the police claimed I sold the agent \$1,370 worth of heroin. I've never seen this money."

Gay said "the buys" (for heroin) were all set up in advance. John S., Gay said, set them up.

Speaking of his use of drugs, he said: "It calmed my anxieties, my nerves, and lessened my sex inhibitions. After I had used it too long, I knew I was physically and psychologically addicted."

"I took it during the height of Dixie Construction," Gay said, explaining he had built 40 or 50 homes in the low-price range.

Gay's barmaid, Virginia Orr, and her brother, Curtis, were convicted also in cases growing out of the purchases made by undercover cover agents at Gay's tavern.

"The Orrs used drugs before I knew them. They used what I gave them. We used it together," Gay said.

"I'm sorry for what I did. I can't turn back the clock," he said.

Gay said he was "mentally unbalanced" by narcotics when he bigamously married Virginia Orr in Chicago in 1961. Gay said that after the second-floor bowling alleys above his tavern were destroyed by fire, he built an apartment over his tavern where Miss Orr lived.

He said the reason he pleaded guilty to six counts of illegal possession of narcotics in 1962 was because he could not "tell my wife and family about Virginia Orr."

His bigamous marriage, he said, is now invalid or the original marriage contract was illegal. (Gay's wife, Dorothy, divorced him shortly after he went to the prison hospital.)

Gay said Miss Orr was in the Lexington hospital twice while he was there, once because of her sentence, and again voluntarily.

"I tried to get her to school. She was in Lexington five months the second time. I got her enrolled in a federally subsidized school, took her to classes. She went three times and dropped out."

"If she ever needs help, I'll help her," Gay said.

Gay charges a conspiracy sent him to prison.

"There was a conspiracy but I broke the law; the sentence was not justified," he said.

He said that during the years he worked, "I gave everything materially to my wife. I signed everything over to her after my arrest."

We agreed about the divorce. We discussed getting together when I got out. I gave her everything materially, but I didn't keep love in the home."

Gay said his former wife has recently returned to him cognovit notes from persons who owed him money.

Gay said he has an apartment building in Cleveland which he is selling on land contract. He draws income from that.

Olimpio Giannini, owner of the Antlers Hotel in downtown Lorain and a bootlegger during prohibition days, said Gay approached him with a business proposition after Gay's release in January.

"I told him I didn't want a sporting house here," Giannini told reporters.

Are you in prostitution? reporters asked Gay.

"I can make money easier than that. I won't go in that direction," he replied.

Gay wound up the interview by relating "a trip" he took on LSD while at Lexington. He said he also tested barbiturates, drugs used in the national space program, and marijuana.

Reporters tried to interview Miss Orr, calling at her downtown Lorain apartment and at the home of her parents in Sheffield but were unable to contact her.

From official sources, they learned that Miss Orr, now unemployed, had been a close friend of Leroy Burns.

Burns is one of six defendants under indictment in a theft of thousands of pills from a Cleveland wholesale drug firm earlier this year.

VICE RAID NETS LORAIN HOTEL BOSS

LORAIN.—Olimpio Giannini, owner of four Lorain hotels, was released on \$5,000 bond after being charged late Friday with keeping a place for prostitution, procurement and attempted carnal knowledge of a 15-year-old girl.

Giannini, 72, was one of four men arrested Friday night in a prostitution raid at his Antlers Hotel, largest hotel in Lorain.

The Antlers is located just a half block from the Lorain City Hall and police station.

The three other men who were arrested and charged are Joseph Church, 39, of 1038 W. 21st Street, a bellboy and bartender at the Antlers; and Frederick L. Atkinson, 30, and Lawrence Keegan, 24, residents of the hotel.

The four were arraigned before Lorain Municipal Judge John Kolena. Giannini will have a preliminary hearing July 14 on the charges.

Atkinson is charged with five counts of procurement, three counts of carnal knowledge of the 15-year-old and harboring a female for prostitution. His bond was set at \$17,500.

Church and Keegan, charged with carnal knowledge of the 15-year-old, had bond set at \$2,500 each.

Lorain police said their investigation was aided by the 15-year-old girl who gave statements about previous experiences at the Antlers. She is being held in the Juvenile Detention Home.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN FIAT-SOVIET AUTOMOBILE PLANT

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be chairman of the Subcom-

mittee on International Trade which reports to the House Committee on Banking and Currency. During hearings on April 11 and 12, relative to the Export-Import Bank, the question was raised as to whether the Bank should be permitted to extend up to \$50 million in credits to cover purchases in the United States of machine tools for the Fiat automobile plant to be constructed in the U.S.S.R.

This led to additional questions as to whether the U.S. Government should permit at this time the expansion of trade with the Soviet Union and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe, and whether the Export-Import Bank should be allowed to finance such expanded trade. These questions, as well as statements made recently before this body and to the press, have made it clear to me that there are widespread misunderstandings and misconceptions with respect to the Fiat-Soviet automobile plant transaction in particular and to our Government's East-West trade policy in general.

For more than 3 months a bipartisan group of members of the International Trade Subcommittee—Representatives JAMES HARVEY, CHESTER L. MIZE, THOMAS M. REES, and myself—devoted intensive study to the Fiat transaction, including discussions in depth with U.S. Government officials and representatives of the American machine tool builders industry. Between December 7 and 19, 1966, we traveled to Italy and the Soviet Union as well as to other countries.

We discussed in further detail the Fiat transaction with officials of the Italian and Soviet Governments, with officials of the Italian Fiat automobile company, and with other private industrial and banking representatives. Our report, representing the combined opinions of the four of us who conducted this intensive study, was published on March 1, 1967.

Perhaps it will be useful, Mr. Speaker, to set forth the basic facts regarding this proposed Fiat-Soviet auto plant which explain why my subcommittee colleagues and I endorsed U.S. participation in this transaction by allowing exports of U.S. machine tools with Export-Import Bank financing. Our position was based upon these findings:

First. Permitting U.S. firms to supply, and Export-Import Bank to finance, up to \$50 million worth of U.S. machine tools for installation in the Fiat automobile assembly plant in the U.S.S.R. will not jeopardize the national security and welfare of the United States.

We are assured that the Department of Commerce will carefully review each application for the export of all tools and equipment for this automobile plant in the Soviet Union. Equipment normally required for the manufacture of light automobiles, like the Fiat passenger cars to be built in this plant, has already been determined by the Commerce Department to be peaceful goods. Based on my personal discussions with Commerce Department officials during our study of this transaction, I am confident that, as required by section 3(a) of the Export Control Act, they will not approve any machine tool exports to the U.S.S.R. that

would be detrimental to U.S. national security and welfare.

All of the equipment involved has well-established uses in the production of civilian-type automobiles, but some might also be used for strategic purposes. The Department of Commerce has announced that export approval of such equipment would be less likely. The Department assures us that it will evaluate such equipment against a number of factors before acting on export applications. Factors that will be considered are—

First. What are the alternative uses of the equipment, and are these of military significance?

Second. Are the quantities and types of equipment requested normal for the job and for this proposed plant? The risk of diversion from automobile production to strategic uses will be carefully assessed.

Third. Is comparable equipment available abroad? Would U.S. export denial effectively prevent Fiat and the Soviets from obtaining such equipment from non-U.S. sources?

Fourth. Does the equipment incorporate significant technology that is extractable?

Fifth. Would export approval adversely affect production of equipment for the U.S. defense effort?

Sixth. Is the equipment ordered by Fiat from the United States an integral part of a large package and, therefore, unlikely to be used for any other purpose?

In weighing these factors the Department of Commerce will consult the Departments of Defense and State and other interested agencies.

Department of Commerce officials have informed me that, according to their technical advisers, only a few of the machines expected to be ordered by Fiat are likely to have alternative uses in the production of military vehicles or other items. This is because machine tools for the production of the small Fiat cars and their components generally are not applicable to the production of heavier components required for military vehicles. Moreover, spokesmen for the American machine tool builders industry have advised our subcommittee group that there is no domestic shortage of automotive machine tools of the types likely to be installed in the Fiat plant. Current order backlogs of the American firms are considered normal.

Our subcommittee group concluded that some exports of autos from this plant may develop, but we are convinced that such exports would be small. Several reasons support this conclusion. The types of Fiat autos to be produced will be specially adapted to peculiar Soviet needs in terms of road and weather conditions, and they are likely to have very limited sales appeal elsewhere. Moreover, internal demand in the U.S.S.R. far exceeds its current and proposed automobile production goals. Finally, the new plant is not scheduled to enter into full capacity production until 1974—7 years from now.

In evaluating the risk to our national security and welfare, we should not

overlook the magnitude of the Soviet capital investment for this plant. We should consider also the additional capital investments they will later need to make for roads, service stations, gasoline, steel and other production materials. Needless to say, the capital that the Soviets invest in this plant and these related activities will not be available for investment in military production.

Second. The Fiat-Soviet automobile assembly plant will provide benefits to the United States and the free world.

Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge wrote our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, on April 12 of this year that—

The product of this plant—light automobiles—is a peaceful item which will in the years to come provide better transportation and increase the standard of living for the people of the USSR, even though the first customers may be their government officials.

I agree with this. It is in our national interest to encourage through peaceful trade with the Soviet Union the improvement of their consumer economy. Even if the Soviet leaders try to keep these Fiat autos from public consumption by restricting their use to Soviet Government officials, I believe that the clamor of the Soviet people for these cars will compel the Soviet leaders to make them available before long to the Soviet people.

The \$50 million that U.S. firms will get for their equipment and the additional returns accruing from sales of their foreign affiliates and licensees should help to improve our balance of international payments, to provide profits for American manufacturers, and to sustain wages and work for American labor. Certainly these are worthwhile benefits to the United States.

Third. The Fiat-Soviet automobile plant will be constructed even if the United States refuses to participate with equipment exports and financing.

Intensive study of this matter has convinced me that our refusal to permit equipment exports and/or credit will not prevent this plant from being constructed by Fiat in the Soviet Union. This conclusion is based on discussions with government and industry officials, here and abroad. In his April 12 letter to Chairman PATMAN, Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge stated:

It is also quite clear that with or without U.S. equipment or financing the USSR can obtain this and other modern light automotive manufacturing plants from Italy and other Western European countries.

In the face of this judgment, it is difficult to understand why we should deprive American business and American labor of the benefits that will accrue from U.S. participation, or why we should want to impair U.S. relations with Italy and the Soviet Union. We would be cutting off our nose to spite our face.

Fourth. The proposed Fiat-Soviet automobile assembly plant has the solid support of the administration.

President Johnson and the late President Kennedy have been given solid support for this transaction by the Departments of Defense—including the Joint

Chiefs of Staff—State, and Commerce, as well as the Export-Import Bank and other interested agencies.

It is in full accord with U.S. Government policy to maintain contacts with the Soviets which can lead to more normal relations and to encourage the Soviet leaders and people toward peaceful cooperation and open societies. Trade in peaceful goods with the U.S.S.R. and the Eastern European countries helps us to achieve these objectives by promoting contacts and exchanges.

This transaction, like other peaceful trade actions, represents a constructive step toward achieving that "balanced strategy for peace" and the diminution of mutual suspicions and fears that has long been the policy of the United States.

If ever we are to use our trade policies and measures flexibly and purposefully—instead of negatively or passively—to promote a wider range of constructive relationships between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, then now is the time and this Fiat-Soviet auto plant is one of the means.

Fifth. The Vietnam war should not deter us from acting at this time but should, instead, impel us to act now.

It is easy—and perhaps even popular—to say that we should drop the Fiat matter until the Vietnam war ends.

I urge U.S. participation in this transaction now because I am firmly convinced that this is the right thing to do at this time. By seizing the opportunity at hand, we will be acting in a constructive manner to ameliorate the international situation outside the Vietnam orbit.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has a responsibility to support and implement our Nation's foreign policy. President Johnson defined our objectives last October 7 when he said:

Our task is to achieve a reconciliation with the East—a shift from the narrow concept of coexistence to the broader vision of peaceful engagement.

Americans are prepared to do their part. Under the last four Presidents, our policy toward the Soviet Union has been the same. Where necessary, we shall defend freedom; where possible we shall work with the East to build a lasting peace.

We do not intend to let our difference on Vietnam or elsewhere prevent us from exploring all opportunities. We want the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe to know that we and our allies shall go step by step with them as far as they are willing to advance.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that it is in our enlightened self-interest to promote closer relationships, including trade with the Soviet Union, at this time. I am not unmindful of the fact that the Soviets are supplying North Vietnam with arms and materiel that are being used against our fighting men. Nevertheless, our basic purpose is to achieve a stable and lasting peace, and this requires not only that aggression be thwarted but that positive efforts be made to fully explore and maximize areas of mutual interest. We must look beyond Vietnam and recognize that the responsibility for maintaining peace and security will rest primarily with the United States and the Soviet Union for many years to come. As a country, I think we have had enough experience to be

able to be realistic about communism without adopting rigid attitudes which only thwart discussion and heighten dangers in an already dangerous world. Certainly we are sufficiently mature and confident as a nation to be able to meet with those countries with whom we have disagreement and to seek accords which promote the cause of peace.

MICHAEL V. DiSALLE ADDRESSES YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MISSOURI, INC.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous manner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently a distinguished former Governor of Ohio and my very good friend, Michael V. DiSalle, addressed the State convention of Missouri Young Democratic Clubs. Governor DiSalle reviewed the history of great Presidents, pointing out that the truly great ones were often attacked and reviled and that President Johnson will rate a high place in history as a devoted servant to the preservation of peace.

Governor DiSalle's illustrative comments to this youthful audience evidences once again the intellectual breadth and wisdom of this great American and I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MICHAEL V. DiSALLE AT YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MISSOURI, INC., 1967 STATE CONVENTION, JUNE 10, 1967

It is a privilege to share the platform of this convention with so many distinguished Democrats. It is a particular pleasure and honor to come to Missouri that has given not only the Democratic Party but the Nation and the world so many great leaders. No Democrat, no American and especially one who has worked for him could resist paying homage to that greatest of all of our fellow citizens, one of the Nation's greatest Presidents and one of the world's all-time great leaders—Harry S. Truman. The Nation is firmer in its democracy and the free world stronger in its resolve as a result of his courage and wisdom. It has been these qualities so capably demonstrated by Harry S. Truman that have brought the Democratic Party from Jefferson to Johnson as the oldest political party in world history and the most consistent in its sponsorship of a greater dignity for the individual. A dignity which incorporates equality of opportunity for all.

From May 13, 1792, when Thomas Jefferson founded the Democratic Party, his philosophy has influenced the course of the party's programs. To those who look back and who would like to read history out of context, it is safe to say that Jefferson's vision did not contemplate a strict construction State's rights party. He did not foresee his party urging that the States be given the authority to deny persons the rights and blessings of American citizenship.

The Jefferson purpose was to create a party which could be really democratic in its makeup, in its partisanship, in its purpose and its method. In fact, it was to be a party that would represent one of the great natural views of government.

Today the Democratic Party remains strong in its advocacy of State's rights, even

in the face of those who seek to confuse this doctrine with license to take away from the individual the rights reserved to him under our Federal constitution.

As a sidelight, today in these troubled times we might just quickly review that the Democratic Party still contends that the individual must be protected from the excesses of a powerful government, whether that government is that of a State or of a nation. It is because of this constant maintenance of this thread of continuity that the Democratic Party today exists as the oldest political party in the world. The foresight of Jefferson remains as the wisdom of today's Democracy. We cannot look back at Jefferson, his philosophy, his wisdom, his vision, without marveling at his ability to foresee the future. This at a time when no thought was being given to nuclear energy, let alone the advances in communication or transportation that have since taken place.

His wisdom is practically confounding when we re-read his letter to Monroe in response to Monroe's request for advice in the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine. In this letter, amidst much sound advice, he asked a question, "Do we wish to acquire to our own confederacy any one or more of the Spanish provinces? I candidly confess that I have ever looked on Cuba as the most interesting addition that could ever be made to our system of States. The control which, with the Florida point this island would give us over the Gulf of Mexico and the countries and isthmus bordering on it as well as all those whose waters flow into it, would fill up the measure of our political well-being." He then dismissed this thought because of the danger of war and risking the enmity of England. Many of us today wish that his musing had been resolved in the affirmative.

It has been said that Andrew Jackson, produced the most turbulent administration in our political history. This, of course, is subject to question, since turbulent administrations seem to be the trademark of Democratic presidencies. At least through the time of Wilson, no other president engaged in such furious and continuous political conflict. It was perhaps the strong feeling on the needs of democratic government which led him to write, "Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions.

In the full enjoyment of the gifts of heaven and the fruits of superior industry, every man is equally entitled to protection by law, but when the laws undertake to add to those natural and just advantages, artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities and exclusive privileges to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics and the laborers who have neither the time nor the means of securing the favors for themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government. Consequently, the philosophy which governs the thinking of the Democratic Party today is that which motivated not only Jefferson and Jackson, but other strong Presidents such as Madison and Monroe, Van Buren and Polk, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, John F. Kennedy and now, Lyndon B. Johnson.

When we scan the record of progress for which these Presidents have been the architects it brings to mind an old Winston Churchill story. Engaged in a particularly difficult campaign in his own constituency, he complimented his opponent on his humility and said that it was an admirable quality but, he added in true Churchillian style, that his opponent certainly had a great deal to be humble about! So we, too, can compliment our Republican opponent on their admirable humility but agree with Churchill that in comparing the record of the two po-

litical parties, our opponents certainly have a great deal about which to be humble.

The life of the Democratic Presidents during the period in which they held office was not an easy one. There was a constant uproar, instigated, motivated and kept alive by those who have always feared and still fear a truly democratic society. Whereas today we honor Jefferson and Jackson, this was not the case during the period in which they were promulgating the programs for which today they are admired and honored. In our own lifetimes we can think of the abuse received by Franklin D. Roosevelt and the position he now occupies in history. We can remember, especially in this area, that the popular sport during the administration of Harry Truman was to revile him, to downgrade him, to abuse him. Today, no fair-minded person can doubt that he has already achieved a great place in history which time will only serve to emphasize and increase.

The man whose assassination shocked the world, John F. Kennedy of revered memory, was the target of many who sought to stop his march toward national progress. Today, the image-makers are not painting a very kind picture of Lyndon B. Johnson but, just as it was difficult to imagine the positions now held in history by Democratic Presidents of the past, here too, history will write a much more favorable page on the stewardship of Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert Humphrey.

We are today again involved in a vexatious conflict which saps our energy, our resources and our humanity. The struggle for peace certainly overshadows the fact that progress is being made in areas of domestic concern. The disruptions that occur in families certainly lead to impatience and dissatisfactions, but regardless of how badly we want peace and how much we strive for it, unless our opponents want peace, its achievement within our lifetime, the achievement of a kind of domestic tranquility that we all long for, can remain beyond our reach. This is a situation where the President needs our understanding, our prayers, our assistance and the patience that will help deal with situations which, in many instances, are beyond our control. We must never forget that for the first time in our experience we are dealing with a rival power which denies the theory and the practice of our society.

We must keep in mind that today wherever we are engaged in the defense of democracy, that regardless of the color of our opponents' jerseys the quarterback is always the same, the name of the game regardless of tactics is always the same and that is, "Beat the United States"—the last capable defender of the free individual, the last obstacle in the path of our opponents' goals of world domination.

They challenge the existence of a democratic philosophy anywhere in the world. In spite of all of our efforts this competition will not disappear. In truth, we will have to live in the same world with this rival. But what we do today will determine whether this living together will be in servitude or in equality. We cannot overlook the facts of the Vietnam conflict as they now exist.

We cannot hide, we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that the so-called "peasant" Vietnamese, the grossly under-rated North Vietnamese, are carrying on a conflict which has every indication that they are possessed of the world's most modern equipment, a seemingly inexhaustible source of supply, that they engage all forms of terrorism and that the techniques, equipment and supplies are being furnished by those foreign powers who are most critical of the United States' involvement and our attempts to preserve a base for freedom in Southeast Asia.

That there is dissent in this country is not unusual, nor is it new. Today we honor the revolutionists who made possible the existence of this free Nation but we must not for-

get that certainly their cause was not blessed with the unanimity of opinion of all those who were residents of the Colonies during that difficult period. The War of 1812 certainly produced its share of dissent, even though at that time we were fighting for freedom of the seas.

During the War between the States, dissent and opposition occurred, not only between the States but down to families and within families. Brothers fought on each side for what each thought were his principles. During that conflict, Abraham Lincoln was faced with the burning of draft headquarters, rather than draft cards. There are areas in the country today which changed political affiliation over our involvement in World War I and World War II.

All of us who lived during the hectic early fifties remember the attack on communism, Korea and corruption.

Today, the free world, including Richard Nixon, pays to Harry Truman the homage he deserved then, for his courage in taking the action necessary to stop communism in its attempt to enslave another nation. That there is outspoken dissent today is just further evidence to the world that democracy continues to exist and to grow while we strive to protect it for others.

Although there can be no limitation on intellectual dissent, there can be no justification where those extremists may call the President and the Vice President of the United States, "murderers," the stupidity and the extremism of the Stokely Carmichaels must be tolerated in the interest of the protection of a Democratic society, but certainly they need not be accepted without counter-attack and exposure. It is because of the President's position during these difficult days that we will continue to see him buffeted by wave upon wave of attacks and counter-attacks.

Those who today are being classified as "hawks" complain that he is not doing enough to bring the conflict to an end by intensifying the military action. Those whom we refer to as "doves" complain that he is not doing enough to bring peace through negotiations. It should be becoming more evident that our position is to seek an honorable peace, limiting the military action as much as possible and urging unconditional negotiations through every means at our command. Attempts by other nations have been spurned. Attempts at Papal intercession have been rejected. Direct communications by the President himself have been turned down. It is evident that every attempt is being made to discredit us and to paint a picture of an imperialistic nation which desires to subject a small and weaker nation to its will.

Too many in our Nation today are overlooking the excesses of the opposition. The words of Communist leaders are being quoted against the announced positions of American leadership. Since when do we assume that the leaders of a philosophy that we have long distrusted are speaking in the interest of Democracy? Since when can we assume that their interest is our future and our success? Shouldn't we remember that we cannot afford to be the Little Red Riding Hood of the 20th century? The bear has sharp teeth—all the better to destroy us if we lose our sense of perspective.

The critics of our Viet Nam policy have been numerous and vocal. It certainly is not too much to hope that they will join in paying tribute to President Johnson for his masterful performance in handling the current Mid-East crisis.

Working around the clock, pressing incessantly for a solution that would restore peace in that constantly troubled area, drawing on the experience of hours of visiting and getting to know the heads and important personages of other nations, he has brain-trusted our world-wide diplomatic network,

while at the same time keeping our anxious legislators informed and in check, and our military forces in readiness. Certainly this outstanding effort on the President's part will rate a high place in the history of the world as a devoted dedication to the preservation of peace.

The latest attempt to frighten the Democratic Party and to try to take advantage of those who lose perspective is the new line that is being peddled, and that is that peace can only come with a Republican victory in '68. Those who are trying to sell this line point to Korea as an example—that it was only after President Truman left office was it possible to negotiate the peace. Those who tell us this fairy tale overlook our continued involvement in Korea, where 15 years later 50,000 men are still committed and billions of dollars have been and still are being spent.

The President is often referred to by his detractors as a completely political animal who seeks only his self-preservation as a politician. How inconsistent can we be, not to give full support to Lyndon Johnson who is staking his political future on what he believes to be the honest posture that must be maintained by this Nation if we are to maintain our commitments and our unsolicited position as the leader of freedom in the world. It is time Democrats review our history and the positions held by Democratic presidents in the past which, although attacked and reviled during their administrations, today constitute the most glorious pages of our history.

Today our Republican opponents are not certain whether to embrace youth or age. If their nominee is young they will base a campaign advocating the role of youth. If he is older, they will support experience. The Democratic Party is always young. A member of the John Birch Society at 24, is older than a Democrat of 83. Lyndon Johnson as the nominee of the Democratic Party in 1968 will have the experience necessary and the youthfulness of ideas, ideals and a willingness to devote himself to the furtherance of peace and increasingly improve standards for not only Americans but freedom-loving people everywhere—as young Democrats looking forward to a better world, you have the responsibility of assisting him in giving him the kind of victory that will help make possible the achievement of our mutual goals.

THE VISION OF C. SCOTT FLETCHER

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 through 7 of this year, the education television stations division of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters held their second national conference on long-range finance of educational television stations.

Under the able chairmanship of C. Scott Fletcher, who was responsible for setting up the Ford Foundation's Educational Television program, the conference produced a lucid, factual, incisive report reviewing the Carnegie Commission's report, "Public Television, a Program for Action," and also making suggestions for further action in increasing the scope and range of educational television.

The 350 conferees agreed according to the publication, that—

The heart of educational television broadcasting is the individual station licensee. Strengthening of local stations should include operations and should occur as a result of local needs. Every effort must be made to increase the number of educational stations.

They further emphasized that general support for local programming by local stations is a priority need, with the main thesis of the report being:

Public television funds should be insulated, independent and, as far as possible, diversified.

The report also included a historical perspective of educational television with quotes by President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, who spoke at the conference, and others from Government, business, and industry.

Mr. Fletcher—one of the, if not the chief expert on educational television in America—was called out of retirement in Florida to become executive adviser to the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. Under his able tutelage the NAEB has made significant strides toward closing the gap between their goal of public television and the existing conditions of the television industry. Mr. Fletcher's ethic of self-sacrifice and efforts toward public television will be harvested a thousandfold by future generations of Americans who will enjoy the benefits of educational television.

I was very gratified to learn that through my efforts and those of my colleagues of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold hearings on the Public Broadcasting Act beginning on July 11. A matter of this importance to the American people both now and in the future deserves careful scrutiny and the utmost priority which I and my colleagues have been able to attain for it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Record at this point the news release issued by the National Association of Education Broadcasters:

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 22.—The concept and principle of a Corporation for Public Broadcasting is strongly endorsed by educational television station managers and their governing boards of directors, it is stated in a report released today by the Educational Television Stations division of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters.

"Public Television funds should be insulated, independent and, as far as possible, diversified."

The report is a result of the Second National Conference on the Long-Range Financing of Educational Television States held here March 5-7.

The 350 Conferees agreed, according to the publication, that "The heart of educational television broadcasting is the individual station licensee. Strengthening of local stations should include operations and should occur as a result of local needs. Every effort must be made to increase the number of educational television stations." They further emphasized that general support for local programming by local stations is a priority need.

The 120-page report covers in detail, results stemming from the Conference. Conference participants were asked to review and react to recommendations to the Carnegie Commission report "Public Television: A Program for Action." Their approval of the

Commission study and amendments they added are found in this pamphlet in Chapter I, "Summary of Conference Recommendations." The third chapter elaborates on the findings.

C. Scott Fletcher, ETS Executive Consultant and a member of the Public Board of NAEB, was Conference chairman.

An historical perspective of ETV is part of the book. Throughout the report are quotes on educational television broadcasting by President Johnson, The Vice President who spoke at the Conference, and others from government, business and industry.

The Appendices includes texts of addresses delivered at the Conference by Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., who served as chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television; James McCormack, chairman of the Communications Satellite Corporation, and McGeorge Bundy, president, the Ford Foundation. Additionally, the appendices has a number of research papers and a diagram of the Carnegie Commission plan.

Copies of the report on The Second National Conference on the Long-Range Financing of Educational Television Stations, compiled and edited by Drs. Warren L. and Serena E. Wade, Wade and Wade Media Consultants, San Jose, California, will be available for \$2.00 from the ETS division, National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

AID FOR THE TOTALLY DISABLED

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives my introduction today of a bill which amends title XIV of the Social Security Act to permit aid to the permanently and totally disabled to be paid, under approved State plans with Federal matching, to individuals in institutions for the mentally retarded. The wording which I propose is:

An institution which is primarily for the mentally retarded shall not be considered an institution for mental diseases.

It is my opinion that action is long overdue to correct the tragic situation of a totally disabled person being denied help because of the type of care he requires. I am aware of many instances where applicants are receiving aid for the totally disabled while living at home, but would lose such assistance when the child is accepted in a facility with six or more residents. I firmly believe that a child, having qualified for ATD, should not be denied the continued support when changing his place of residence. Therefore, to assist individuals who are 18 years of age or over and permanently and totally disabled—but not blind—in attending an institution which is primarily for the mentally retarded and not an institution for mental diseases, I have introduced legislation to broaden the scope of aid to totally disabled, which, in my mind, is long overdue.

HUGHES AIRCRAFT EXHIBIT OUTSTANDING AT PARIS AIRSHOW

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, among the spectacular displays highlighting the recently staged 27th International Paris Airshow were exhibits of American space technology featuring Surveyor, the first soft-landing, picture-taking unmanned spacecraft to land on the moon, and Intelsat II, the world's first commercially operated communication satellite to be operational over two oceans.

These space achievements, internationally acclaimed by space scientists and the world public, bear tribute to Hughes Aircraft Co., of southern California, one of the 111 American companies that were representative of the U.S. aerospace industry at the show.

In the lunar exploration field, Hughes demonstrated an engineering competence which has seen the successful landing of two Surveyor spacecraft on the moon. Hughes has built seven spacecraft for NASA to explore photographically selected regions of the moon for the space agency's lunar manned-landing program. A third Surveyor is at Cape Kennedy now, awaiting launch in mid-July to a new region of the moon.

As an electronics firm whose skills embrace the entire technical spectrum of unmanned space exploration and space communications, Hughes originally envisioned the synchronous communications satellite principle in 1959. Today, 8 years later, five operational satellites born out of that vision are in operation 22,300 miles out in space above the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans.

Two of these are the Syncom satellites Hughes built for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which were launched in 1963 and 1964, respectively. They subsequently were taken over by the Defense Communications Agency and are in use now for military traffic between the United States and the Far East. One is above the Pacific Ocean, the other is over the Indian Ocean.

The Early Bird satellite represents the second generation of synchronous altitude spacecraft. It was launched over the Atlantic in 1965 for the Communications Satellite Corporation.

The third generation of satellites, popularly known as Intelsat II, were also built for Comsat, and were both launched early in 1967 into around-the-clock commercial service above the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans.

International aerospace industry acclamation is well deserved for the many dedicated teams of scientists and engineers at Hughes who have made possible these man-made stars which have illuminated the frontier of space.

The Hughes exhibit at the Paris air show, which I had the privilege of at-

tending, reflected the many and varied contributions she has made to our Nation's defense and our space exploration program.

I know that my colleagues in the House of Representatives and my fellow Americans share my pride in our aerospace industry, which, thanks to firms like Hughes Aircraft, was so ably represented at this international show.

SAN ANTONIO HEADSTART EFFECT GROWING WIDELY

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include at this point the text of a picture story on the accomplishments of the Headstart program in San Antonio, which appeared in the San Antonio Evening News on July 5, 1967. As reporter Mavis Bryant states:

Teachers find rare hidden abilities in children from deprived homes, as well as depressing cultural gaps.

The value of Headstart is well summed up in the sentence:

The enthusiasm of teachers and supervisors in the Headstart program seems to radiate to parents and others in the community, giving them a sense of purpose and participation.

The article referred to follows:

SAN ANTONIO HEADSTART EFFECT GROWING WIDELY WITH 800 CHILDREN IN 53 CLASSES (By Mavis Bryant)

A kid who never has heard the English word for arithmetic hardly could be expected to add, subtract and divide.

And this is where Head Start comes in.

The Head Start program, a poverty-war baby now half as old as the slum kids it serves, aims at filling the gaps that throw many youngsters behind in school from the beginning: cultural, linguistic, nutritional, medical.

As one teacher put it, "Then we hope the child can devote full attention to learning to read and write."

The San Antonio Independent School District, one of several San Antonio districts with Head Start programs, has 800 children in 53 classes this summer. They are housed in 16 centers concentrated in poverty areas. Children qualify for the program if their families make under \$3,000 a year.

According to Mrs. Doris Brown, one of three directors of the program this summer, highly personal attention to each child is the key to the program. In each class one teacher, one paid aide who is a mother from the poverty area, one Neighborhood Youth Corps assistant, and at least one volunteer from the community at large can spot and minister to individual problems. Spanish-speakers among those supervisors aid materially in teaching English to the child who knows little.

"One of the major benefits of the Head Start program is what the paid aide mothers learn and take back into their homes and neighborhoods," said a teacher at Herff Elementary School. "This helps parents to un-

derstand and get involved in their children's education."

Parents' involvement is emphasized by program directors. A Mothers' Ad Hoc Committee in each school recommends subjects which might interest parents attending weekly open houses. In the weekly meetings parents visit classrooms, hear speakers, talk with teachers, and see their children perform.

"You just can't understand what may be troubling a child until you visit his home and talk with his family," commented pretty Mrs. Josephine Perales. "We're going to try to incorporate this into the regular program." Teachers visit each child's home twice during the eight weeks, to gain greater insight into particular environments and also to explain to parents about the program.

Mrs. Perales uses all the resources of David G. Burnet Elementary and the program to teach her pupils basic concepts. During the summer they will build kites, plant seeds, use recording machines and film strips, learn to paint, and many other things.

A visit from the local fire department, with engines and firemen, was a highlight for youngsters at Herff Elementary, according to Mrs. Perales' sister, Mrs. Charlotte Garcia, who teaches in the program there.

"The kids climbed all over the trucks, and the firemen explained everything to them. They loved it," she said.

For many children, the first visit to a doctor or dentist is a terrifying experience if they think they will be hurt. During the summer each pupil will receive thorough medical, dental, visual, and hearing examinations, along with blood tests for anemia and a battery of shots. One doctor cleverly combated child apprehension by calling in one child, who emerged and chose a friend to be next, and so on.

Required medical care can be provided free under the program if parents cannot foot the cost. But nurses, in cooperation with five social workers, often have a hard time getting parental permission for the child's treatment. Clothing and shoes can also be provided when necessary.

Any teacher may find a student who simply does not respond to classroom activity, or one who is such a behavior problem that class is disrupted continually. The program maintains 10 counselors who work with teachers to deal with such individuals. Special testing, individual care by a volunteer, home visits, and other measures may help the child adjust. One child who spoke only German, for example, was assigned an interpreter who translated everything the teacher said during the classes.

"I could get them to eat beans all day, but beef pie or spinach is another story," said the cafeteria director at Burnet.

Children in the program are served breakfast and a hot lunch each day.

Teachers prepare the pupils in class for new foods they may encounter at lunch, and cereal cartons are used for many different things during the day. Eating with knives, forks, and spoons present a real challenge, too, for a 6-year-old who has used only a tortilla previously.

Teachers find rare hidden abilities in children from deprived homes, as well as depressing cultural gaps. One tiny Mexican-American, with a father in the penitentiary and a mother who deserted him and his three small brothers and sisters, lives with a grandmother who speaks no English at all.

Yet, at five, eyes shining with intelligence, he knows how to read and can do addition and subtraction. His teacher cannot find anyone who has taught him those things.

The enthusiasm of teachers and supervisors in the Head Start program seems to radiate to parents and others in the community, giving them a sense of purpose and participation. A father of one student built a scale-model "kitchen," with stove, icebox, and sink, from cardboard, for his class to use.

And a real joy for workers at Burnet is the help given by volunteers from the Golden Age home across the street.

Besides acting as volunteers, the elderly make rainbowhued bean-bags for the children to use.

"We have one lady who throws away her cane as she walks into the classroom because she doesn't want the kids to think she's old," said a teacher.

TO PROHIBIT TRAVEL OR USE OF ANY FACILITY IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE WITH INTENT TO INCITE A RIOT OR OTHER VIOLENT CIVIL DISTURBANCE

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider H.R. 421, providing an amendment to title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbances. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this badly needed legislation.

For weeks now, the newspapers, radio, and television have been reporting the outbreak of riots and civil disturbances in various sections of our Nation. These riots, although local in nature, are festered by professional agitators who flip from one city to another with but one purpose in mind, start a riot.

It is no secret that the Nation's Capital has been earmarked to be the site of a civil disturbance. What are we going to do about it? Sit here and wait until it happens, then throw up our hands in horror and rush to put through an anti-riot bill?

The bill that has been scheduled this coming Thursday makes it quite clear that it is not the intent of the statute to preempt State law. The intent is to supplement local law enforcement.

Congress must show these people who take the law in their own hands that the American public is fed up with such action and will not stand for it any longer. Congress has been served notice and it is time we face up to our responsibility.

MEAD JOHNSON FOREIGN AFFAIRS SEMINAR

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, one of this Nation's progressive businesses is Mead Johnson Co. of Evansville, Ind.

Each year the company conducts impressive seminars for its executives.

It was my honor this year to address this group of intelligent and alert businessmen.

The following is the text of my remarks at the Mead Johnson foreign affairs seminar:

No region of the world is more varied or fascinating or challenging than Asia. It is primitive and modern, changeless and changing, savage and gentle, grim and gay, old and new.

Within the vast sweep of its 16,900,000 square miles, extending 5,300 miles from North to South and 6,000 miles from East to West, there is at once diversity and similarity: a diversity of people, language, custom; similarity in environment, tempo and a way of life.

Only in Asia, with its population of 1.8 billion people, is it possible to leave an air conditioned house complete with television set and electric kitchen in the metropolitan city of Manila, get into an automobile and within a day's drive over a modern highway, reach the mountains of Northern Luzon where primitive tribes still use spears with poisoned arrows and go about almost naked and raid the lowlands to kill and take human heads.

In Asia you can find a progressive monarchy in Thailand, a socialist dictatorship in Burma, Communism in China, a parliamentary democracy in Japan, a military and civilian triumvirate in Indonesia.

The Asians like to point out that Asia was civilized when Europe was a forest and a swamp. It bears the imprints of its own traditions and cultures, but also those left from the colonial era by Great Britain, France, Portugal, Spain, The Netherlands, and the United States.

It is the cradle of religions, containing more Buddhists, Hindus, Confucians, Taoists, Shintoists, Zoroastrians, Moslems than any other continent. Also more tribes worshipping the spirits of animals and trees.

To understand Asia (if indeed it can be understood) it is necessary to recognize the major forces shaping the future of Asia.

There is nationalism. It is both good and bad.

It can be a unifying force, rallying all the diverse groups within the country and giving them a sense of national unity.

It can direct their energies toward national goals and eliminate internal divisions.

It can give them greater security against foreign domination and internal subversion. But nationalism can also be dangerous and disruptive.

It can destroy any efforts toward regional and international cooperation.

It can destroy any basis for foreign investment and produce pointless, wasteful and dangerous wars.

It can hinder rational analysis and sober tackling of problems.

It can subordinate the material welfare of whole populations to emotional resentment.

The best and the worst of nationalism can be seen in Sukarno and Indonesia.

Sukarno did give the Buddhists, the Moslems, the Javanese and the Sumatrans a sense of national unity and purpose. But this nationalistic force almost destroyed all that it had created.

In Burma, nationalism has meant an economic war against foreign investors which has very nearly destroyed the country's economy. In Thailand, it has meant a national unity which has produced a stable government, dramatically improving the economy.

Communism is the second major force shaping the future of Asia. This is by no means a single, monolithic, united force.

Communism in Asia has many faces: There is the well-organized, prosperous,

legal Communist Party in Japan, seeking its support from the urban worker.

The Philippine variety is a revival of the Huk insurrection.

The party in Thailand seeks support from the mountain tribes.

In South Vietnam, the support comes from the peasants.

Communism in Asia is also caught in the struggle for leadership within the Communist world between China and the Soviet Union. China aims to make the entire area a sphere of Chinese domination and believes that the United States power and influence are the chief obstacles to its goals. China therefore supports and encourages any force that is alien and hostile to the United States.

The Soviet Union wants to undermine both the United States and China. Peking and Moscow are competing for the loyalties of all the Communist parties in Asia, whether these parties are dominant, as in North Korea and in North Vietnam, or minor, as in Australia and the Philippines. The rivalry is seen most sharply in South Vietnam.

A third major force shaping the future of Asia is the thrust to defeat Communism.

This thrust has many facets: United States troops in Vietnam,

United States military and economic aid, The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, The British Defense Treaty with Malaysia.

SEATO came about mainly as a result of the American effort after the Communist victory over the French in Indonesia. It seeks to unify the international forces against further Communist gains. It has, of course, some serious defects:

Neither Pakistan nor France have really committed themselves to opposing Communism in Asia.

It has certainly had to rely too heavily on United States power. But it remains a major instrument to blunt the Communist thrust.

These three forces—nationalism, communism, anti-communism—operate in a continent facing massive, enormous, almost overwhelming problems—ineffective government, over-population, inexperience in self-government, poverty, the low levels of education, inadequate food production, the shortage of capital, the effects of the struggle for and against Communism, the pressure of powerful outside forces.

These enormous problems are producing what I hope is becoming a fourth major force: co-operative multinational efforts to solve the problems. I want to discuss this in a little more detail later. It is one of the most encouraging developments in all of Asia.

Given these major forces shaping the future of Asia, what is United States policy in Asia?

The central propositions of that policy are two-fold. One, the extension of control over other nations by Communist China, North Korea or North Vietnam is unacceptable. Such control would create a menace to all countries and present a major and direct threat to the national interest of the country.

Two free and independent states in Asia, working effectively for the welfare of their people, are in the long run necessary to prevent the extension of a hostile power and are in our world-wide interest in peace and prosperity.

These two central propositions are the cornerstones of American policy in Asia. They have been since the end of World War II. They have been carried out by four Presidents and both political parties.

Our military action, our military aid, our strategic alliances, our economic assistance programs, our commitment of military resources are all part of this grand strategy.

If you will draw back, I think you may be surprised at what has happened in Asia, part

of which at least may be attributed to the success of that policy.

Japan has made a spectacular advance and soon will become the third ranking economic power in the world.

South Korea, devastated by a conflict only a few years back, has now carried out genuine democratic elections and is beginning to make real economic progress.

The Republic of China has beat back Communist threats on the off-shore islands, carried on sound economic policies—including land reform—and made it possible for the United States to terminate economic assistance. The Republic of China has even started a technical assistance program of its own in other parts of the world.

The Philippines have beat back a Communist Huk rebellion and have become a working democracy.

Thailand, one of the bright spots in Asia, is making steady progress.

Malaysia and Singapore have become independent, self-governing (although the United States has not been directly involved.)

Indonesia was, of course, under Sukarno sharply hostile to the United States. It very nearly came under Red Chinese control. The change in Indonesia has been one of the most dramatic developments in all of Asia. At present Indonesia is prepared to live at peace with its neighbors, turning attention to its own, long-neglected social and economic problems.

All these things viewed in the light of the prevailing circumstances, permit us to draw some satisfaction from developments in Asia. But that's not all.

Among the chief reasons to be hopeful in Asia is the emergence of regional multinational, cooperative efforts to increase the tempo of economic and social progress. There is significant and heartening evidence of progress toward cooperation to meet common problems among the widely diverse countries of Asia.

Asian leaders proclaim the new concept of cooperation publicly and repeatedly. They increasingly recognize that it is in their national interests to foster a community of nations as an alternative to discord and conflict.

Illustrations of this new habit of cooperation which hopefully will produce beneficial results, are many:

1. The Asian Development Bank, a soundly conceived financial institution with a membership of 19 Asian and 11 non-Asian nations to assist in the financial development of the region.

2. Japan's initiative to host the Southeast Asian Development Conference.

3. The Southeast Asia Agriculture Conference.

4. The Southeast Asia Education Conference last November.

5. The habit of regular consultations among the central bankers and planners in Southeast Asia.

6. The Association of Southeast Asia has been reactivated. This includes Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines.

7. The Asian and Pacific Council consisting of 9 Asian nations met last summer in Seoul, Korea. (First such meeting in history.)

8. A number of United Nations projects have been active in practical development problems throughout Asia.

These and other groups are tackling the basic problems of Asia. The Ministers of Education reviewed the problems and the priorities and explored areas of regional cooperation in education. They will continue to work on a permanently organized basis, supporting centers of technology, tropical medicine, agriculture, higher education, English language, science and mathematics, and educational radio and television.

Cooperative efforts are underway to plan for the development of transportation and communications systems.

Surprising progress is being made on the Mekong Plan, a multi-national effort to develop the full potential of the entire Mekong River Valley. This requires the close cooperation among the four riparian nations and can make a significant contribution to peace and stability in this area. Increased food production will be a major benefit. Today the basin is characterized by six months of floods and six months of dust and drought. There is practically no double cropping. The potential for development is very great indeed. It is now getting underway.

Japanese survey teams have studied 34 sites for dams along tributaries.

Thailand and Laos have agreed to exchange electricity generated by dams on the Mekong and its tributaries.

Last year two tributary dams were completed in Thailand and the first electricity ever generated on the Mekong was transmitted. Eight nations are involved in financing the construction of another dam in Laos.

The Indian government is completing a feasibility study for a dam across the Mekong. The Dutch have made navigation and canal studies. The French have made electric power surveys.

In all 21 nations and 10 United Nations agencies have been involved so far in the Mekong development program.

A significant aspect of this regional development has been the increased involvement and participation of other developed countries. Japan has exceeded expectations and is now clearly committed to provide more aid to Southeast Asia. The Netherlands have increased aid. Canada, Australia, New Zealand will contribute proportionately.

But much work needs to be done here in order to persuade other developed countries to do their share, remembering always that the main initiative must lie with the Asians.

Our top level diplomats are more and more impressed with Asian officials and businessmen. They believe them to be gaining a command of the fundamentals of economic development. They recognize the priority items: increased agricultural production, increased emphasis on education, the necessity of Asian initiative and participation.

So far I have pointed to factors which permit us to be cautiously optimistic about Asia. I don't want to overstate it. Any assessment must also acknowledge the obstacles—the future is filled with uncertainties and difficulties.

Vietnam, of course, is the major one. It represents the principal difficulty to be overcome. In the question and answer session that follows, I'll welcome any questions you may have on Vietnam. For the moment I simply want to mention Vietnam in the context of the broad sweep of our Asian policy. U.S. actions in Vietnam are important in themselves but they are also vital in the wider context of a free Asia.

It probably is not an overstatement to say that the shape of all things to come in Asia depends largely on the outcome of the struggle in Vietnam. If Communism is defeated there prospects will brighten for all Asia. Democratic forces and tendencies will be strengthened. The new cooperative efforts would have a much greater chance of succeeding with the basic social and economic problems. With less Communist interference, even nationalism might become less irrational and damaging.

A Communist victory in South Vietnam would bring the Communists to power in all of Vietnam and Laos. Communist pressures would certainly be strongly turned on Thailand and another long and bloody struggle would loom. Cambodia, if not taken by the communists, would at least become a Communist satellite with little freedom of action.

It is in the context of the future of Asia that the Vietnam struggle has to be assessed and judged.

Vietnam, of course, is not the only problem of Asia.

There is, as you know, an exploding birth rate. The population of Asia is growing at the very critical rate of 2.7% a year. This growth seriously limits the efforts to develop countries.

The Philippines, for example, had a gross national product growth rate of 4.4% per year. But the birth rate was 3.3% leaving real growth at an unacceptable 1.1% per year.

The related problem is agricultural development and food. The scale, severity, and duration of the world food problem, especially concentrated in Asia, is so great that unprecedented efforts are going to be necessary to master it.

Next to the pursuit of peace the greatest challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase. Today that race is being lost. Asia must give population control and agriculture development the highest priority.

There are also severe economic problems. The foreign trade of most of these nations is predominantly based on commodities and raw materials. 63% of Burma's export trade is rice; 73% of the Philippine exports are sugar; 73% of Indonesia's exports are rubber and oil.

Wild fluctuations in prices of these commodities and raw materials bring about severe economic dislocations. The effect of world prices for these commodities is felt instantly in the Far East and felt painfully.

It would not be proper to conclude a discussion of Asia without mentioning the role of China. China, of course, presents the major obstacle to the kind of Asia we seek.

China has many severe problems, giving rise to disputes over basic policies—foreign policy, military strategy, economic development. This, in turn, has created the more basic problem of maintaining effective government during the struggle over the issue of who is to govern.

Mao thinks that the indoctrination of the Chinese peasant should liberate enormous energy providing power for a surge forward in production. This is the so called cultural revolution. It has the marks of a power struggle, shaking the positions of those who oppose Mao in China.

Mao, who instituted the Great Leap Forward, wants to eliminate pragmatic, economic policies including those which maintain material incentive to stimulate production. Mao thinks that measures like private plots for the peasants, rural semi-free markets, systems of pay keyed to performance, pose the danger that China will follow the revisionist course of the Soviet Union. He wants full-scale Communism and Socialism.

Most recent reports indicate a Peking engaged in quieting down the uproar and trying to restore the normal operations of the Communist system.

China has suffered severe setbacks internationally in recent years. They were not able to persuade the Afro-Asians to proceed With a Bandung conference. They had great difficulty in several African countries and were expelled from several. They marched uphill and down again in the fighting in India. They were disappointed by the Tashkent Agreement. They suffered a major setback in Indonesia—the Communist Party there has been disseminated. In their struggle with Moscow for leadership of the world Communist movement, they have lost ground.

They see the power of the United States committed in Southeast Asia to repel aggression supported openly by them.

China wants to become a world power—someday she will be—but today she lacks many of the attributes of great power status. They are determined to rectify that situation. They have one of the largest armies in the world. They have developed

the H-bomb. They are developing a missile delivery system. They are putting heavy proportions of their industrial effort into military and military related fields.

Perhaps the most serious problem in international affairs today (not just in Asia) is how to get Peking to move to a policy of peaceful co-existence.

The main elements of our policy are to do nothing to encourage China to believe that it can profit from aggressive action, and to make it plain that if they will give up their belief that force is the way to resolve disputes and abandon the violent strategy of world revolution, we are ready to welcome China to an era of good relations.

I have tried to give you the broad sweep of Asia. Maybe it is too big a subject. I mentioned the major trends in Asia—nationalism, Communism, anti-Communism, regionalism, the underpinnings of United States policy, the reasons for hope, the problems we face, including China.

There is no ground for complacency. Difficult situations remain, notably Indonesia, the Philippines. We have to look beyond the Vietnam war. In a sense, the primary purpose of our policies in Asia is to prevent another Vietnam.

Progress is slow in Asia but the general trend is upward. The threat of Communism is growing weaker. The forces of co-operation are gathering momentum. National cohesiveness is growing. The success stories—Japan, Republic of China, South Korea—show what can be done.

The United States will not soon be out of Asia. The simple, if unacceptable fact is, Asia is too weak at the present stage of its history to determine its own destiny. Either Asia relies on the United States and its allies to protect it from direct Communist domination, or Asia must accept that domination and make do with being within a Chinese sphere of power and influence.

William Wordsworth wrote that the world is too much with us. A major part of that world—Asia—will be with us for many years to come.

CAN CONGRESS SEE THE URBAN BIG PICTURE?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, this year the Joint Economic Committee has established a new Subcommittee on Urban Affairs, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri, and upon whom I have the honor to serve as a member.

This subcommittee is an outgrowth of an interest for several years of Mr. BOLLING and of the Joint Economic Committee, and we are all very happy that a study can now be undertaken to provide a very broad sweeping investigation of the problems in the Nation that have become obvious through their appearance in acute form in our heavily populated urban areas.

Recently the editor of the publication Nation's Cities interviewed Chairman BOLLING on the subject of urban affairs. The exchange of questions and answers provides a very valuable insight into

the problems of our city, and the approach that the subcommittee's investigation is to take. I, therefore, commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and place it in the RECORD at this point:

CAN CONGRESS SEE THE URBAN BIG PICTURE?

(NOTE.—Another urban-minded Capitol Hill study is beginning, this one by the recently-formed Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the influential Joint Economic Committee. To learn its implications to municipalities, Nation's Cities Managing Editor Don Lief interviewed Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.), chairman of the subcommittee. Congressman Bolling has represented the Kansas City area since 1949 and is highly regarded for his ability to be effective even while calling for reorganization of the House. A ranking member of the Joint Committee, he is a leading figure among House liberals. During World War II, Mr. Bolling served more than four years in the Pacific theatre, rose from private to lieutenant colonel, and was awarded the Legion of Merit and Bronze Star. Born in New York City in 1916, he received B.A. and M.A. degrees from the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., and also attended Vanderbilt University in Nashville.)

Why has the new Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee been formed?

For years I have wanted such a subcommittee and now the circumstances are right for it. What I want to do is something different than has been done in the ordinary legislative committee or in the other studies that have been undertaken. Without criticizing either kind of investigation, I have felt basically from my experience when I first came to Congress 20 years ago that anything but a whole approach was being taken to the problems of urban affairs. I suspect they may turn out to be problems of the nation as a whole which are more obvious because they are more acute and more concentrated in the heavily urban areas.

Part of this, too, is I felt we were overspecialized in the field. The "housers" seemed to believe that housing, including public housing, was the answer. Subsequently, urban renewal, including vast demolition, was the answer. Well, in Washington, D.C., 550-600 acres in the southwest section were razed and the poor people booted out. They moved into northwest and new blight was created. In sum, people in different disciplines decided that their portion of knowledge was the whole field of knowledge and that little else need be done.

What I want to do is to take all these different approaches and disciplines, some of them very broad and philosophical and mainly intuitive, some of them very specific, anything but philosophical, and test them out against each other; first by getting a set of papers from carefully chosen specialists. Then calling them in for hearings—having them remixed in panels so that you might have a social psychologist dealing with a person whose only field was a relatively narrow range of transportation. And those two approaches, plus two or three others, rubbing against each other. At the same time we have a conservative and a more liberal point of view represented on the subcommittee.

There would then occur an abrasive process that would hopefully break down the provincialism, the parochialism, the compartmentalism that I feel happens to exist.

How do you conclude that this approach is suitable?

The reason I feel that way is that we have at our disposal a whole lot more knowledge and a whole lot more technology and a whole lot more ability to solve urban problems than we have the will to do it. If you can accomplish this kind of thing—and I don't think there is any evidence you cannot—then you

perhaps will move faster toward, not a consensus, but an agreement that the area is broader than any one of its parts.

That is basically the reason why the subcommittee was established. This subcommittee does not start with any conclusions—at least so far as its chairman is concerned.

Your method suggests that urban problems could be helped by better communication.

I think it is a matter of communication and, I would add, information. And I think it is a matter of organizing knowledge and improving it quite deliberately, initially from a very academic point of view. I do not happen to be one who feels that an academic approach leads inevitably to a "nonaction" conclusion.

I want to emphasize that I am not proposing this study as a tactic of stalling currently operative programs. I feel remedial programs are so urgently needed because urban problems have been with us for so long and so long neglected that we are probably 30, 40, or 50 years behind already. In other words, I am not going to vote against what I consider imperfect partial solutions in order to await for the perfect.

Do you have personal views on how important the city is in relation to the national economy?

Well, clearly it is an enormous problem because of the fact this is a largely urban society—the conventional statistic being that 70-to-75 per cent, or 198,000,000, of all Americans live in urban areas. But these problems are inseparable from rural problems. In extent, they are different because you have such concentrations of people without adequate employment, transportation, etc., but in kind, they may be similar problems. The problem of the urban poor may be similar to the problem of the poor in a backward Appalachian town. If we don't help the cities more quickly, it will have enormous economic consequences as well as social.

Will some "people-oriented" experts be part of your dialogue here?

Yes. Jane Jacobs, for one, has pointed out the tragedy of over-reliance on physical renewal. We have, in our urban ventures, too often fragmented people and their wants and desires and their functions as entities. But we now realize people are very complicated entities. So I think you have to have people-oriented as well as physical-oriented.

I think that the impact of the kind of use that is made of the space has an impact on individuals which may or may not be measurable, may or may not have a good or bad effect. Perhaps you've read Hall's *The Hidden Dimension*.

Now, I have always been a strong supporter of public housing. The only good bill that I voted on in my early years in Congress was the great Housing Act of 1949 which recognized the concept of urban renewal and had great chunks of public housing in it. I have never regretted my affirmative vote, but I think it is true that public housing has turned out to have certain disadvantages. I think it would have been nice if we recognized the disadvantages, but obviously we did not.

Our whole environmental problem, concentration of certain kinds of people, the failure to intermingle, for example, as they have in the remarkable blocks in New Haven where all different kinds of housing are provided—housing for the elderly among others.

You told our National Legislative Conference last year about the need for mayors to make themselves heard in Washington. Have you seen any significant changes in how they are being heard these days?

Clearly, the mayors must have played something of a role in our salvaging at least one matter from defeat. That would be the fact that we got 35 Republican votes on the "model city" appropriation in May. I would

like to ascribe this to a greater effective participation on the part of the mayors.

Besides what yours and other committees are doing, do you think there is anything else that Congress might do in respect to urban-metropolitan problems?

Limiting myself to the House, I think the House is enormously badly structured to function on an over-all problem such as the urban problem. There is no single committee to deal with an urban problem. But I am not sure that you could establish a committee with exclusive jurisdiction over urban affairs because you would be running into the practical problem of committee jurisdiction that would prevent favorable action.

The Congress, as well as the Executive Branch, should reorganize itself so that it was more realistically organized to deal with broad problems. But that gets into a whole other field on which I have written a book.

As you plot the course of the committee's study, what attention will you pay to the economic impact of local government actions, local government behavior?

This whole area is critically important and it is infinitely complex. For example, I represent much of Jackson County, Missouri. For the first time in more than 30 years its residents are going to vote late this month on a substantial set of bond issues—more than \$100 million. Most people feel it will be defeated because we have an antiquated state law. A two-thirds vote is required to pass such a bond issue. If it were to pass, and we in Congress were to provide matching funds, for every dollar that the people of Jackson County will be taxed to pay for those bonds the people of the United States would be taxed \$1.50.

There you have gotten both the county and the state and the Federal Government involved in one phenomenon—a so-called "marble cake" in terms of the relationship. A major question is—how sophisticated is the newly affluent urban middle-income group going to be about these benefits.

The impact is obvious, both the impact in terms of what it takes from the community to build structures and what the economic impact will be on a community if, for example, you construct an adequate hospital facility and—for the first time in the history of the area—the less well-off receive reasonably good medical care. The ultimate economic impact of this would be fantastic.

Some local government actions have relatively little to do with the actual expenditure of money but rather such things as zoning and land use.

How quixotic are certain aspects of building codes, not to speak of zoning, around the country. Even building codes are confusing enough in one area where a certain kind of cable is necessary to clothe a wire and in another, a different kind. Differences in zoning cause confusion compounded by chaos.

Former Sen. Paul Douglas heads a presidential commission working in the areas of zoning and building codes. I think a more uniform approach to local problems might make a vast difference, even within a limited area.

Perhaps on a metropolitan basis?

Yes. Title II of the most recent Housing Act is designed to encourage this. And I have been involved enough in the problem of pollution in my own area to know how many political jurisdictions you get involved in when you try to achieve cooperation in a community like Greater Kansas City. I think they add up to over 130.

How much independence do you think the normal general purpose government, city or county, ought to have in respect to, say, its own tax rates or whether it be allowed to issue industrial aid revenue bonds, and so on?

I think there ought to be a national policy on industrial aid revenue bonds. They have

had their utility in the past, but I think that they can turn into a monster without too much trouble. The national policy that we have today is not to have one, really.

But I think that here you come to the dilemma that takes you off to a different tangent. The reason the cities came to the Federal Government for assistance is that they found no help in most of the state legislatures. Current estimates are that between now and 1975 the gap between local needs and local funds will be about \$262 billion. The reason they found no help in most of the state legislatures is the rural gerrymander.

In the 1960's, the Supreme Court came down with a ruling in *Baker v. Carr* that required fair representation. Now, if the quality of state legislatures improves, as did Maryland's, you might see a greater interest on the part of people such as myself in a variant of the so-called Heller Plan for tax sharing. Until such a happy state of affairs is reached, I would be very, very reluctant to accept any sharing of federal taxes with the states or with any other entity until there was established some kind of standard as to the quality of performance at the state level, and at a higher quality than is now in a number of areas.

It raises an infinity of very complicated problems. Personally, and this is not just a pious statement. I would much prefer if we were able to reorganize the various levels of government so that a great deal more of it would really adequately support it at, not a lower level, but at a level closer to where the action and the people are.

Do you think that your subcommittee can come up with anything that judges the healthiness of the rapid increase in local indebtedness? Is this an economically sound rise?

I do not find the increase in indebtedness alarming yet—certainly not at the federal level. If you take the federal debt as a percentage of the GNP, it becomes highly insignificant compared to 1946. But I think we are going to have to do a much more sophisticated job of selling the voter, the taxpayer, on what he is really dealing with when he votes an indebtedness. He is really deciding that he is going to pay deferred taxes with interest in many cases. He really has to be more sophisticated. If he is going to demand services, he is going to have to pay for them at the state, city, or federal level.

In light of this ever-rising demand, do you think that there is possibly a new approach to financing public facilities such as federally supported urban development banks or pools of funding?

I have no objection to studying the feasibility of that kind of a thing. We have done an infinity of important things through federally subsidized programs. The subsidy is often small and the amount of capital generated has been very large on occasion. Of course, in a very tight money market, you have a problem as to how effective a small interest subsidy is in obtaining long-term funds.

Do you see a relationship clarified by your investigations as to national fiscal policy and its impact on local economic matters?

Of course there is a relationship. We know what happened to housing starts last year because of the so-called tight money market—down from an annual rate of about 1.6 million units to slightly above 1 million, as I recall. So there is this business of linkage. The federal budget allocations play a major role in our economy and this can set the tone for employment and by indirection education and other variables.

I am thinking in addition to the taxing policy, national monetary policy and the tightness of the money market for local bonds.

Well, I've answered part of that already. It was apparent that we needed a tax increase

in 1966. Otherwise, we were bound to have the kind of impact that we did on housing. It was a selective impact because we forced the monetary authority to take too much of a burden. I think we are in trouble this year partly because we failed to have that tax increase last year, but for somewhat different reasons of mix. Obviously, this whole business of financing underlies your ability.

I surmise that, if we had unlimited money, the problem of the urban areas would not be so great because there are "miracles" that we can perform today technologically that we haven't felt we could put into effect. You know, at last year's Woods Hole conference, a participant, referring to urban racial unrest, said maybe it would be better instead of trying to cool your people with street hydrants, maybe the thing would be to cool their houses—that is, put in air conditioning. It sounds fantastic, but, upon reflection, maybe it would not be.

You are talking here about cost-benefit analysis?

Indeed, but the first step that I want to achieve before we get involved in too much of cost-benefits is to see if broad, philosophical agreement can be reached for a total approach—systems-analysis fashion.

Now, this is not the kind of approach that is so general that it achieves nothing or goes nowhere. It is just designed to give an umbrella to all the different things you must do to put all those different things in some relationship. Otherwise you really can't begin to sell the public on the parts of the program that it doesn't see as of immediate benefit to them.

It is very difficult to convince the mobile, play-oriented middle-class that they must support and become active in programs to help the urban poor, some of whom live in neighborhoods resembling casbahs rather than ghettos. They don't believe there are any poor there. Incredibly, the affluent don't see the poor—and yet there may be 30,000,000 of them.

I must add that American business—Hallmark Cards, Reynolds, Alcoa, U.S. Gypsum—is already helping in housing.

If the political support were such that urban programs were more fully funded, what would be the main economic obstacles to sound use of the money? Where might we start to improve the machinery in advance of additional funding?

Nothing less than a herioc response will be needed from federal, state, and local administrators to establish, for example, a workable, effective revenue-sharing mechanism. We don't have it and we're not sufficiently preparing for it at a state and local level particularly. I prefer local programs locally arrived-at—but it is not dogma, and to my mind "self government" is not exclusively synonymous with "local government." Then of course Sen. Muskie's work on his inter-governmental relations committee may develop other avenues.

What would be the impact in urban-aid programs should U.S. spending in Vietnam be sharply reduced—in effect, would it make any difference in today's Congress?

I'm skeptical of arguments, advanced by Vietnam doves for example, that if the war ended today the federal spigot could and would be played on our inventory of urban needs. Well, there have been seven key votes so far in the House of Representatives as of our interview today and, believe me, the tone is charcoal gray conservative. The House strangled rent supplements, model cities had a close call, and the crowbar crew is out to dismantle the poverty program.

Do you think that the city programs are paying for Vietnam?

Well, it is all the programs that affect the disadvantaged. I would rather put it that way. Vietnam spending is estimated at \$1.5 to \$2 billion a month. Cities, of course, get the most of the disadvantaged, the poor, and

the people that do not get an education—one source states there are 10,000,000 poor in large urban areas. They are the ones that are caught. I think the programs that are paying the price are the ones that would help those who need help—those that do not get an adequate education, those who do not get health benefits.

We must correct this. The City is the frontier and we've played urban roulette long enough. The City is worth saving. If the subcommittee can generate some unconventional wisdom, we—all of us together—may do just that.

LEGISLATION TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CRIME

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the rate of crime in the Nation is increasing at a staggering rate. Present figures indicate that crime is growing six times faster than the population of the country.

Only in the last few months, we have seen reports from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, and from the Task Force on Science and Technology. These studies go far in telling us of the kinds of problems we face in the control of crime, and where our society has fallen down in protecting itself.

One thing, however, is missing. In spite of the work which has already been done in the area, we have not as yet provided a way to interpret these and other studies into legislative proposals, nor have we in Congress provided ourselves with adequate means to research independently the issues involved.

Today, I join my colleagues who have already introduced legislation to create a joint committee to investigate crime. The bill was first introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and it is designed to create a joint committee of Congress to study all aspects of crime. In addition to making independent studies, the committee would be empowered to make reports to Congress with such recommendations for action as it deems proper.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time we in Congress took initiative on the problem of crime. Crime has been given as the reason supporting legislation ranging from gun control to poverty, but we have yet to address the real problem of crime itself.

I say it is high time that we do so.

WIDE SUPPORT FOR CHICAGO MINT

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on January 16 I introduced legislation, H.R. 2432, that provides for the establishment of a U.S. mint in the city of Chicago.

Since the introduction of this legislation, there has been widespread endorsement for a mint in Chicago among both the banking and business communities.

It is clear, based on the experience of our recent coin shortage, that expanded coinage facilities will be needed in the future. By mistake, some have viewed my bill as a threat to the existing coinage facilities in this country. On the contrary, I fully believe that existing mints should remain in operation and be modernized, but, in addition, a new mint should be established in Chicago; thus, giving us mints in Philadelphia, Chicago, and Denver, with a standby facility in San Francisco.

Shortly after the introduction of my legislation, Mr. Samuel W. Sax, president of Exchange National Bank of Chicago, took the time to conduct some research on first the need for an additional mint, and second, Chicago as its logical choice. It is a well thought out, factual study and because of this, I am placing it in the RECORD for use by other Members. I am also making a part of my statement letters received from various business leaders in the Chicagoland area supporting H.R. 2432.

The material referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to indicate:

1. The need for additional U.S. Mint facilities.
2. The reasons for locating the additional facilities in the Chicago area as proposed in H.R. 2432 introduced by the Honorable Congressman Frank Annunzio on January 16, 1967.

PART I

The Bureau of the Mint presently has three coining facilities in operation. The U.S. Mint in Philadelphia started production in 1793. This mint will be closed and replaced by new facilities in the latter part of 1967. The U.S. Mint in Denver started coinage operations in 1906. The U.S. Mint in San Francisco started operations in 1854, but was closed in 1955 due to outmoded and antiquated facilities. This facility was reactivated by Section 201 of the Coinage Act of 1965, Public Law 89-81. The San Francisco Mint was reopened in an attempt to help alleviate the critical coin shortage. There are 37 coin distribution points that are supplied by these facilities.¹

In recent years, demand for coin has surpassed the production capacity of the Mint. In an unsuccessful attempt to equate supply and demand, the following steps were taken:

1. The San Francisco Mint was reactivated.
2. Equipment was added to the Denver branch.
3. A program of coin rationing was initiated by the Federal Reserve System.
4. The production of proof sets was curtailed.
5. The production of foreign coins was suspended.
6. Although uneconomical, three shifts five days a week and in some cases three shifts seven days a week were undertaken.

Mrs. Fern V. Miller, Superintendent of the U.S. Mint in Denver related that operations have been on a three shift five day a week basis in an attempt to meet demand and replenish a depleted inventory.² Recent figures on domestic coinage executed appear in Table A.

The total capacity of each mint operation by shift is reflected in Table B. One might argue that with an annual production of 20 billion pieces of coin, shortages will cease to exist. The weakness of this argument lies in the fact that the estimated output of 20 billion pieces of coin is unrealistic and uneconomical for the following reasons:

1. Arthur D. Little, Inc., whose survey on the operation of the mint represents the most comprehensive study on this subject since Alexander Hamilton's "On the Establishment of a Mint" communicated to the House of Representatives, January 28, 1791, concluded in their analysis of multi-shift operations that the mint should operate its plants (either new or existing facilities) two shifts a day.³

2. The San Francisco operation is intended to be a temporary expediency. Authorized production of coin will continue there until the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the U.S. Mints are able to produce ample supplies of coins.⁴

In relation to the above considerations, Table B indicates that production on a two shift basis in Denver and Philadelphia would only total 7.2 billion pieces.

The most important single factor affecting our coinage situation is the demands arising from the needs of business and those arising from non-business channels. Coin requirement is directly proportioned to population changes and level of economic activity. The additional amount of coin required to satisfy the needs of a larger population undoubtedly accounts for a significant proportion of the increase in the nation's coinage needs. The population growth, however, fails to explain completely the advance in the amount of coin in circulation. The major determinant of coin usage is the advance or decline of GNP. Cyclical changes in the public's coin holdings roughly coincide with fluctuations in Gross National Product. As the level of business activity advances, individuals and business firms require more coin to settle an expanded volume of transactions. Conversely, as the pace of the economy slackens, the supply of coin demanded by the public tends to decline.

In order to project the long run demand for coin, the Government uses the Department of Commerce estimates of the Gross National Product, projected population figures, Department of Labor price indexes, sales tax figures, and estimated vending machine sales. The Government cannot estimate the amount of hoarding and speculation. These two factors affect the flowback of coin to the Federal Reserve System. In the third quarter of 1962, the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank received 2,761,000 coins from the Mint and 58 million pieces of coin in flowback, while in the third quarter of 1964, the Bank received 10,625,500 coins from the U.S. Mint but only 3,614,000 in flowback.⁵

The available methods of predicting coin needs have not proven accurate. In its report on future Mint requirements, Arthur D. Little, Inc., predicts that the stock of coin in circulation will increase at a rate of 5.8%

² Phone Interview, Mrs. Fern V. Miller, Superintendent U.S. Mint, Denver, Feb. 10, 1967.

³ "Production Facilities for the United States Mint". Final Report to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Arthur O. Little, Inc. Feb. 11, 1963, p. 19.

⁴ Section 201 of the Coinage Act of 1965, Public Law 89-81.

⁵ "Coin Dearth Hits Stores and Banks." *Chicago American*, Dec. 10, 1964.

per year.⁶ Table C contains Little's projected coin production requirements through the fiscal year 1990. A comparison of Table A and Table C will reveal immediately the discrepancy in the Little projections. The Little projection for fiscal year 1975 is a requirement of 7 billion pieces of coin, while in fiscal 1966, 8.7 billion pieces of coin were executed and demand was not satisfied. Our present Mint facilities have been structured to produce coin according to the projections contained in the Arthur D. Little report. These predictions must be questioned in light of increasing population, Gross National Product and related non-economic factors. With conditions being as they are, the need for additional mint facilities is evident.

House Report No. 194, which was the sixth report by the Committee on Government to the first session of the 89th Congress, dated March 22, 1965 made several recommendations with reference to the coin shortage question. Recommendation "E" reads as follows:

"If and when estimated future needs for coin are indicated to be such that coin could not be produced efficiently and economically by the existing facilities of the Mint, consideration should be given to the timely construction of a new mint, at a location which would be determined upon such economic factors as concentration of population, distribution and transportation costs, commercial conveniences, and availability of labor."

PART II

The need for additional mint facilities has been established. This section of the report will substantiate the choice of Chicago for the site of this facility.

A major cost area of the mint operation is the transportation of finished coin. This factor makes the transportation features of a site very relevant to its being chosen. As the transportation hub of the United States, Chicago has long been recognized as the railroad center of the country. The Chicago Terminal Railroad District is served by 41 railroads.⁷ Approximately 1,219,000 tons of freight are shipped in and out of the city on a normal business day.⁸

Chicago is the center of a vast complex of interstate highways. The city is served by national regional, and local motor freight trucking companies. More than 400 motor freight companies move interstate commerce and in addition, approximately 2,000 regional and local trucking firms serve the Chicago Metropolitan Area's hauling requirements.⁹

These transportation facilities would be used by a Chicago mint to economically distribute coin to the Federal Reserve Banks and Branches. The distance from the present mints and from the proposed Chicago mint to the thirty seven distribution points is compared in Table D. Fifteen or 41% of all the distribution points are closer to Chicago than either Denver or Philadelphia. Exhibit 1 illustrates Chicago's relationship to these fifteen points.

When minting facilities are available, the United States Government contracts with foreign governments for the minting of the latter's coin. In recent years, the mints have been working to capacity on domestic production so all foreign coinage has been suspended. Upon resumption of foreign coinage, Chicago's importance as a mint site will be heightened. Chicago is the only deep-water port in the United States which is at the junction of two inland water routes. The

⁶ Arthur D. Little, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁷ "Seaport of Chicago," Advertising Supplement to the *New York Times*, Sept. 19, 1966.

⁸ "Chicago Transportation Facts," Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, 5th Edition, Nov., 1966, p. 28-T.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 28-T.

¹ "Coin Shortage." Sixth Report by the Committee on Government Operations, 89th Congress, 1st Session, March, 1965. Union Calendar #84 "House Report #194" p. 6.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and the 6,000 miles of the Mississippi-Ohio River system which links Chicago and the Gulf Coast are excellent routes for shipping coin to foreign countries.¹⁰

The level of economic activity in the Chicago area has made it a prime user of coin. In fiscal 1965, the 7th Federal Reserve District Bank in Chicago and branch bank in Detroit received 1.2 billion pieces of coin out of a total of 7.2 billion pieces distributed.¹¹ The 7th Federal Reserve District received more coin than any of the other districts and population and economic forecasts indicate that this situation will continue.

From 1961 to 1966 Chicago's Gross Metropolitan Product rose from \$27.287 billion to \$37.6 billion, an increase of 37.79%.¹² This brought Chicago's share of the Gross National Product to 5.09%.¹³ This is noteworthy since Chicago's 7,395,600 people in the metropolitan area only account for 3.82% of the nation's population.¹⁴ Also, during this period metropolitan Chicago's Total Personal Income increased 24.37% while unemployment dropped to 2.95%.¹⁵ This helps to account for the fact that 5.12% of the Nation's Disposable Personal Income is in Chicago.¹⁶ With respect

to the 7th Federal Reserve District, recent census figures show the population of this area to be 14.8% of the entire U.S. population.¹⁷ This 14.8% concentration is larger than any other Reserve District including the 12th District's 12.9% and the 2nd District's 12.4%.¹⁸

One of Chicago's greatest assets is its vast pool of skilled labor as evidenced by Chicago's outstanding production record. Illinois has 6.37% of the total U.S. labor force, most of which is located in the Chicago area.¹⁹ Chicago's highly diversified industrial atmosphere and its stress on equal opportunity employment will continue to attract an experienced and productive labor force.

The many impressive factors in favor of having a mint located in Chicago are evident. There is no doubt that Chicago offers the most favorable conditions as far as central location, working conditions, transportation, labor supply and most of all the largest market area for new coins. A mint should be located in Chicago so that the most economically sound system of distribution and operation can be obtained and one that will benefit over 41% of the receiving points of coins in the United States mint

system. A mint located in Chicago can, in addition to improving coin conditions in the middle section of the U.S. improve the overall economy and structure of the present mint system.

TABLE A.—Domestic coinage executed (excluding proof coin)

Fiscal year ending 1964-----	4,307,341,770
Fiscal year ending 1965-----	7,231,406,086
Fiscal year ending 1966-----	8,674,761,925
Fiscal year ending 1967 (first 6 months)-----	4,994,752,681

Source: Bureau of the Mint.

TABLE B.—Mint production capacity (In billions)

	1 shift	2 shifts	3 shifts	4 shifts
Philadelphia (new)-----	2.0	4.0	6.0	8.0
Denver-----	1.6	3.2	4.8	6.4
San Francisco-----	1.4	2.8	4.2	5.6
Total-----	5.0	10.0	15.0	20.0

Source: The Coin Situation, 29th report by the Committee on Government Operations, May 2, 1966, p. 12.

TABLE C.—Forecast of total domestic coinage requirements

(In billions of pieces)

	Fiscal year														
	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1980	1985	1990
Forecast requirements-----	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.8	5.1	5.5	5.8	6.2	6.6	7.0	9.6	13.0	18.0

Source: "Production Facilities for the United States Mint" final report to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget submitted by Arthur D. Little, Inc., under contract No. EB-88 revised Feb. 11, 1963, p. 2.

Table of miles from U.S. mints to distribution points

	Denver	Philadelphia	Chicago		Denver	Philadelphia	Chicago
1. Boston-----	2,008	*313	975	9. Minneapolis-----	855	1,179	*412
2. New York-----	1,852	*94	843	Helena-----	*829	2,259	1,478
Buffalo-----	1,554	*365	529	10. Kansas City-----	641	1,141	*499
3. Philadelphia-----	1,770	(*)	762	Denver-----	(*)	1,770	1,016
4. Cleveland-----	1,373	425	*343	Oklahoma City-----	*619	1,444	797
Cincinnati-----	1,245	578	*295	Omaha-----	557	1,213	*476
Pittsburgh-----	1,476	*294	461	11. Dallas-----	*805	1,561	936
5. Richmond, Va-----	1,762	*257	796	El Paso-----	*679	2,127	1,434
Baltimore-----	1,697	*106	687	Houston-----	*1,049	1,648	1,085
Charlotte-----	1,630	*547	1,779	San Antonio-----	*975	1,795	1,220
6. Atlanta-----	1,464	816	*695	12. San Francisco-----	*1,288	2,960	2,189
Birmingham-----	1,364	937	*656	Los Angeles-----	*1,189	2,829	2,095
Jacksonville-----	1,789	*915	1,009	Portland-----	*1,365	3,006	2,112
Nashville-----	1,205	855	*451	Salt Lake City-----	*515	2,193	1,431
New Orleans-----	1,314	1,312	*925	Seattle-----	*1,442	2,943	2,063
7. Chicago-----	1,043	759	(*)	Cash Division, Treasury Department, Washington, D.C.	1,707	*139	687
Detroit-----	1,302	588	*275				
8. St. Louis-----	895	887	*291	Total miles serviced to cities marked by *	9,706	3,030	7,892
Little Rock-----	904	1,217	*644	Average miles traveled-----	882.36	303.00	493.25
Louisville-----	1,167	689	*301				
Memphis-----	1,109	1,076	*544				

* Distribution points nearest to existing and proposed mints: Denver, 12; Philadelphia, 10; Chicago, 15.

Source: Additional mint facilities, hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 26, 1963, p. 34.

MICHIGAN AVENUE NATIONAL BANK
OF CHICAGO,

January 31, 1967.

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO: I read with

¹⁰ "Chicago World Port," Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, 7th edition, 1965, p. 4.

¹¹ "Annual Report of the Director of the Mint. For Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1965," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1966, p. 10.

¹² Interview with John Coulter, Secretary Research and Development, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Industrial Research Dept. 2-10-67.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

great interest the information you recently forwarded to me regarding the bill which you have introduced in the House of Representatives for the establishment of a United States Mint in the City of Chicago.

You have my whole-hearted support in this action. The heavy demand for coin in this area, the transportation savings and the personnel available make Chicago an ideal location for a Mint.

Your efforts are greatly appreciated, and if I can be of any help to you in this project, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

R. L. CURTIS, President.

¹⁷ "Distribution of Bank Deposits by Counties and Standard Metropolitan Areas", Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, June 30, 1962.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ "Economic Fact Book", Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, 1966, p. 6.

MADISON BANK & TRUST CO.,
Chicago, Ill., January 24, 1967.

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: You are to be complimented for your introduction of H.R. 2432 which provides for the establishment of a United States Mint in the City of Chicago. Frankly, I can't conceive why this was not done years ago. Chicago, as the hub of the mid-west region, having to get its coin from either the east or the west makes absolutely no sense. Considering the problems of coin shortages that we've had in the last several years (I don't remember when I last saw a half dollar) facilities for minting coin in our country should be expanded in any case, and in fact, from a transporting point of view, having a United States Mint in Chicago would save innumerable dollars in transportation costs.

I do hope that you pursue this matter as vigorously as possible and perhaps even en-

list the support of Senators Dirksen and Percy, as well as other members of the Congress from Illinois and our adjoining mid-west states.

Sincerely yours,

A. ANDREW BOEMI.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF CHICAGO,

Chicago, Ill., February 1, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My associates and I are very pleased to learn that you again introduced the Bill H.R. 2432 to establish a mint in Chicago. We concur in your judgment that this would be a wise and economical move by the United States government.

Chicago is the economic capital of America's vast mid-western region which serves more than 60,000,000 Americans. This pivotal location is at the very focus of air, water, rail, and highway transportation, close to the national centers of population, industry and raw materials. It is estimated, for example, that about 72 per cent of all American cities of 60,000 and more are within 500 miles of Chicago, less than one hour by jet.

More people and more goods can be transported from Chicago to the rest of the nation in less time and at less cost than from any other metropolitan area. In this simple fact lies the primary reason for Chicago's economic strength. Located just north of the U.S. center of population, it is the nation's most efficient market place—the most strategic location for nation-wide marketing operations.

American business has capitalized on these factors and has made Chicago the nation's "Supermarket"—the merchandising and distribution hub of the United States.

These same facts strongly support the logic and wisdom of your position that Chicago should be the site of a new United States mint.

Yours very truly,

HERBERT V. PROCHNOW,
President.

CONTINENTAL ILLINOIS NATIONAL
BANK & TRUST CO. OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., January 27, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: In accordance with your request, I am pleased to enclose statement with respect to the establishment of a United States Mint in the City of Chicago, as proposed in H.R. 2432, as follows:

"Assuming a need for expanded production of coinage, the proposal of Rep. Frank Annunzio to establish a United States Mint in the city of Chicago is eminently practical.

"The existing geographical pattern of Mints—at Philadelphia, Denver, and San Francisco—was established to serve production and distribution requirements that have disappeared under the influence of new technology, population shifts, and modern transportation.

"Chicago's central location, and its consequent superior ability to serve the entire nation, make it the logical site for a Mint facility planned to offer the maximum in economy and efficiency."

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. GRAHAM,
Vice Chairman of the Board.

CHICAGO FEDERAL SAVINGS
& LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., January 26, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANNUNZIO: I was very pleased recently to learn that you had introduced H.R. 2432, which provides for the establishment of a United States Mint in the City of Chicago,

and both personally and as president of Chicago Federal Savings and Loan Association I endorse your proposal 100%.

Considering that Chicago is really the axis for a preponderance of commercial, industrial and financial activities here in the mid-west and, indeed, is the hub city through which much of these activities funnel from both the east and west, it seems only natural and logical to us that a United States Mint should be located in our area. In addition to effecting considerable savings in transportation costs, it would certainly bring immeasurable benefits to our city in business and in prestige. When you consider that in terms of dollar size our state ranks second only to the State of California in savings entrusted to our thrift institutions, one must conclude that such a facility in close proximity would be extremely advantageous to our activities.

We hope that you are successful in demonstrating to your colleagues, to the members of the Banking and Currency Committee and to the Public Works Committee the need for a Mint in the Chicagoland area.

Cordially,

THOMAS F. WALDON.

CENTRAL NATIONAL BANK OF CHICAGO,
January 30, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am pleased to learn of your introduction of H.R. 2432, and would like to lend my support to this worthwhile measure.

In view of the fact that modernization of U.S. Mint facilities appears to be a matter of some urgency, this would seem to be the proper time to create a new Mint and to locate it in Chicago, from where the best service can be rendered. Some of the problems which were faced last year helped to focus our attention on the desirability of a most responsive production facility located to serve both the Middle West and, through our unexcelled transportation, the entire country. H.R. 2432 would achieve this purpose.

With best personal regards,

Very truly yours,

FRANK E. BAUDER.

AMERICAN NATIONAL BANK & TRUST
CO. OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., January 30, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO: I applaud your efforts to establish a United States Mint in Chicago. The entire economy as well as the Chicago Metropolitan area stands to benefit by making this center of population also a leading financial center.

As you know, a tremendous effort is being undertaken to accomplish this objective. Your proposed mint, besides serving the coin needs of a large section of the country more efficiently and with less transportation cost, will also serve to hasten the acceptance of the area as a principal financial center.

I would also hope that the timing for such a project would take into account the period when the added coin production would be necessary as well as the fiscal affect of the added Federal Expenditure. Our first priority should be the elimination of a deficit in a period of prosperity.

Cordially,

ALLEN STULTS.

BELL SAVINGS & LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., February 2, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANNUNZIO: Congratulations on your efforts to establish a United States Mint in Chicago.

Passage of your bill, H.R. 2432, would be beneficial not only to the Chicago area but

to the entire nation. Chicago's central location, transportation facilities and the availability of skilled labor are all assets unequalled elsewhere in our country.

I am sure you will receive support from legislators throughout the Midwest, since the availability of coins is a problem which all financial institutions have faced in recent years. Midwest commerce and industry would benefit a great deal by establishment of the Mint as you propose.

Best wishes on your efforts.

Yours truly,

HAROLD P. HALLEEN.

HOME FEDERAL SAVINGS AND
LOAN ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., January 26, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter stating that you have introduced H.R. 2432, providing for the establishment of a United States Mint in the City of Chicago.

I think it is a splendid idea. The central location of our city would permit the disbursement of coins at shipping charges far less than those for shipping coinage from mints removed from the central area of the United States.

As a savings and loan, we are not required in our usual day to day business to provide coinage service to our customers. However, because our quarters are located on a merchandising street, we have, for purposes of convenience to our neighbors and customers, provided coin service in limited quantities. Many times, the shortage of coins that has cropped up in the past, prevented us from accommodating many of our customers and merchant neighbors.

I have discussed this matter with the Cook County Council of Insured Savings Associations and the Federal Savings and Loan Council of Illinois. Membership of both of these organizations is composed of savings and loan institutions, both state and federally chartered, in the metropolitan Chicago area. I am asking them to support your efforts in any way they possibly can, in order to bring this activity into our area.

I will explore other possibilities where I feel some help may be obtainable. If you have any other suggestions where I may be of further help to you, please let me know. Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

OTTO L. PREISLER,
President.

THE NATIONAL REPUBLIC
BANK OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., February 10, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
U.S. Court House,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO: I was pleased to receive your letter of January 20th and also read your remarks placed in the Congressional Record. I wish to congratulate you for your efforts on behalf of our City.

There is no doubt in my mind that the acute coin shortage that has plagued us at various times in the past several years, has made it necessary to build additional facilities to mint silver coins. I am sure that the Banking industry, together with its many Merchants, would applaud your sponsoring this Bill and a great credit to you on your foresightedness to obtain such facilities for Chicago.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD PARRILLO, President.

METROPOLITAN BANK & TRUST CO.,
Chicago, Ill., March 10, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANNUNZIO: Thank you for your letter of January 20 transmitting a copy of

your proposal for establishing a United States Mint in the City of Chicago.

My associates and I heartily agree that this would be a worthwhile move that would produce multiple benefits. The recent coin shortage certainly would have been lessened if there had been another producing mint, and Chicago is the most logical place for a fifth mint because of its importance as a key financial center. Furthermore, Chicago's centrality means greater convenience, and significant economies.

You may consider this as our endorsement of your proposed Bill, and please feel free to call on us if we can lend any assistance to you in seeing this Bill through to passage.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. WALLERSTEDT.

THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of this Congress the recent controversy in the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Rural Development in which the chairman of this subcommittee has leveled a rather harsh attack on the American Farm Bureau.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me state that I speak as a Member of this Congress who has been actively engaged in a very small farming operation in Alabama and as one who has been associated with a small independent agribusiness dealing in fertilizer, seed, and cotton ginning for better than 20 years. There have been many occasions when I differed with the policies of the American Farm Bureau. There have been other occasions when we fought side by side trying to improve the farmer's status in an agriculture that has seemed to be constantly in trouble, with the exception of wartime periods, since the depression days of the 1930's.

The charges leveled by our subcommittee chairman were serious ones, Mr. Speaker, and intimated that this farm organization is more concerned with selling insurance than it is in actually working for the betterment of farm people. Certainly, my own Alabama Farm Bureau offers insurance to protect farm homes from fire and windstorm just as it offers life insurance to protect the widows and orphans of a farmer who might be accidentally killed while driving his tractor or who might die of natural causes. The Alabama Farm Bureau also indirectly offers to its members tires, fertilizer, baling twine, and other related agricultural supplies. Actually, the insurance program of the Alabama Farm Bureau began in 1946 at a time when many general insurance companies would not write fire and extended coverage on rural property. At that time, the Alabama Farm Bureau rate on \$5,000 extended coverage was \$80 per year. Today the same coverage costs the farmer only \$21.68 per year.

Mr. Speaker, this is the story of a group of farm people who got together

in the interest of protecting their homes and related farm property. Even today many companies do not write coverage of this type which was in fact initiated by the insurance division of the Alabama Farm Bureau. The Alabama Farm Bureau is a service organization and only through service, including that of insurance to its members, can it justify its existence to its more than 96,000 members in my State.

Mr. Speaker, the charge has been made that people join the Farm Bureau principally because they can buy cheap insurance and since I carry a policy with my own Alabama Farm Bureau, I can state that in many cases their rates are somewhat less than those of commercial companies. This is a savings that accrues to the members of this farm organization and I find no fault with these savings being passed on to their membership.

The charge has also been made that the "primary purpose of the American Farm Bureau is the operation of a mammoth insurance network." However, I notice that in my own State every Farm Bureau member does not necessarily carry Farm Bureau insurance.

The charge has also been made that the Farm Bureau has not been representing the American farmer, but it has been my observation that over the years there has been no group anywhere who has been consistently more interested in legislative programs for American farming than has this organization. There have been times when I felt that the Farm Bureau might have been overly interested because they have always spoken out and waged a vigorous fight for the principles they believe in. They are dedicated to agriculture from the individual county organizations through their State and national organizations and my reason for belonging to this organization is not that I carry the small insurance policy, but because I believe that my farmers need an organization such as the Alabama Farm Bureau to represent them in handling farm problems at the county, State and national levels and I continue to believe that my Farm Bureau is working diligently to achieve for the farmers of this country their fair share of the good things that America has to offer.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR PEACE AT THE SUMMIT

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this editorial in the Detroit News deftly sums up the most important development of the summit meeting between Premier Kosygin and President Johnson. It states:

They met at a summit, and, as President Johnson said, they got acquainted with each

other. That, whatever tacit understanding was reached . . . is the most important consequence of the Middle East crisis.

This meeting produced a greater understanding between the two leaders on the great issues that divide the world and cause tensions and anxieties. These problems are not solved easily. But a significant first step has been made at the Glassboro meeting—a step toward full understanding of where the United States and the Soviet Union stand on the issues which divide us.

This is no small accomplishment. For if peace is to become a reality for the world family, it will come only when greater trust and understanding can be a reality for the great powers.

President Johnson has been the loyal servant of peace. The American people salute his efforts at Glassboro.

I insert into the RECORD the editorial from the Detroit News, entitled "Hope at the Summit."

THE SPIRIT OF GLASSBORO: HOPE AT THE SUMMIT

They met at a summit and, as President Johnson said, they got acquainted with each other. That, whatever tacit understanding was reached at their first meeting or may be achieved in today's conference, is the most important consequence of the Middle East crisis.

It is sufficient comment on our times that a President of the United States and a premier of the Soviet Union have not met for six years, not since the ebullient Nikita Khrushchev confronted a John Kennedy, only five months in office, six years ago in Vienna. At that time a crisis loomed—Berlin—and Khrushchev tried to browbeat a young man who took his measure and 16 months later faced him down over Cuban missiles.

This weekend the leaders are meeting in the aftermath of a crisis, not before it. The hope has to be that they are assessing each other and that from these meetings they will be able to maintain and broaden the understanding they reached over the Washington-Moscow hot line three weeks ago.

So many things have crowded in during the quick survey they were able to make of the world situation since their predecessors met—De Gaulle, Vietnam, the India-China rupture, and above all, the entry into nuclear power of Red China.

Perhaps the most vital point in their remarks after their first meeting at Glassboro was not what they disagreed about in the Middle East crisis but their mutual agreement that something has to be done, and quickly, about stopping the spread of nuclear weapons.

They were spurred to this by the fact that one week ago China demonstrated it had achieved thermonuclear capability. Six years ago, Mr. Kennedy and Khrushchev did not foresee that within a year and a half they would be in confrontation about nuclear weapons. This time both President and premier can see the ominous shadow of China on the horizon. Ideologies apart, they know what Red China's capability can mean to the tenuous balance of power Washington and Moscow have maintained since Cuba.

Four years at Geneva have not brought about a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. But even before Mr. Johnson and Kosygin met, the Americans and the Russians have come closer together on a pact than some of the interested nonnuclear powers, such as West Germany, India, and Japan, have been capable of accepting.

If there is one benefit from the quickie Middle East war, it has to be the unspoken acknowledgment by such nonnuclear powers

of how much it can be in their own interests not to go nuclear and thus reduce the risks of confrontation in so many areas of the world.

In view of the stated opinions of both leaders about what caused the Middle East crisis and how to seek a viable peace after it, agreement on the issues that divide the United States and the Soviet Union in this instance was impossible. But again, their meeting together, not eyeball to eyeball, but face to face in a town almost no one had ever heard of until three days ago, injects life and meaning into a dialog that no teletyped hot line messages can evoke.

In general, summits without agendas are meaningless. But summits between two who are forced to deal with matters of substance are in a different category. It would be foolish to think sweetness and light will flow from the Glassboro meetings. On the other hand, it would be equally foolish to think that some misunderstandings have not been obviated by this conference. At least if neither party knows exactly what to do next, each has a better understanding of what not to do next.

ASKING POST OFFICE TO ISSUE A COMMEMORATIVE STAMP IN 1969 IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have today written Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien asking that the Post Office issue a commemorative stamp in 1969 in honor of the 100th anniversary of the founding of professional baseball. Several of my constituents including the former president and general manager of the Cincinnati Reds, William O. DeWitt, requested the special stamp.

The year 1969 will mark one of the most significant milestones in sports history—the 100th anniversary of the founding of professional baseball. Cincinnati is proud to have been professional baseball's birthplace. On behalf of the Queen City, I would hope that the Postmaster General, issues a commemorative stamp marking the historic occasion.

The Cincinnati Red Stockings of 1869 could hardly have envisioned the heights of popularity which baseball would reach. The Cincinnati Reds plan to move from Crosley Field to a new riverfront stadium in 1969 and hope to host the all-star game in that year.

I would welcome the support of my colleagues in urging that the Post Office Department issue a commemorative stamp in honor of the 100th anniversary of the founding of professional baseball.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PHILBIN):

Mr. TUNNEY, for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, for to-

day and tomorrow, on account of official business.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

Mr. MOORE, for today, on account of official business.

Mr. WATSON, for today, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Texas) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland, for 60 minutes, July 13.

Mr. SNYDER, for 20 minutes, on July 12.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Texas), for 10 minutes, on tomorrow, July 12, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks made in connection with S. 853 and include an editorial.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Texas) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of Michigan in two instances.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. ZION.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. BURLERSON.

Mr. KEE.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1111. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2762. An act for the relief of CWO Bernhard Vollmer, U.S. Navy (retired).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 12, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

892. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on transportation and production problems on the supply of Middle East oil, pursuant to the provisions of section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

893. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of problems in processing claims against voluntary relief agencies arising from alleged loss or misuse of food donated for distribution abroad, Department of Agriculture, Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

894. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev., to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

895. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a resolution of the Legislature of American Samoa, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would permit American Samoa to be represented in the House of Representatives of the United States by a nonvoting delegate; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

896. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on all standards to be initially applied in carrying out a highway safety program, pursuant to the provisions of section 302, title 23 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report entitled "Communist Activities in Latin America, 1967" (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 729. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 421, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 11328. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 11329. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 11330. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to secure to physically handicapped workers employed in sheltered workshops the right to organize and bargain collectively, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 11331. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11332. A bill to amend section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to facilitate the procurement of certain surplus personal property by State agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for certain amounts set aside by a taxpayer for the higher education of prospective college students in his family, and a tax credit for certain amounts otherwise paid as educational expenses to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLOREY:

H.R. 11334. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 11335. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for physicians' charges under the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved, and to amend title XIX of such act to permit payment to a recipient of assistance for physicians' charges under the medical assistance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 11336. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to provide day care for children of low-income families in order to enable their parents or relatives to choose to undertake vocational training, basic education, or employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11337. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 11338. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Adult Education Act of 1966 for 2 additional years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11339. A bill to assure the purity and quality of all imported dairy products for the purpose of promoting the dairy industry and protecting the public health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11340. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 11341. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11342. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11343. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11344. A bill to amend title XIV (and title XVI) of the Social Security Act to permit aid to the permanently and totally disabled to be paid, under approved State plans with Federal matching, to individuals in institutions for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 11345. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 11346. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act in order to provide priority for grants under that title for projects for the construction of hospital facilities damaged or destroyed by tornadoes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 11347. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to authorize certain surplus property of the United States to be donated for park or recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 11348. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the establishment of special procedures designed to avoid undue delay in the payment of monthly insurance benefits to which individuals are entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 11349. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 11350. A bill to reclassify certain key positions and increase salaries in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11351. A bill to provide for the granting of national service life insurance to Vietnam conflict veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 11352. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 11353. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive study of the polar bear and walrus for the purpose of developing adequate conservation measures; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 11354. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to increase the Federal ship mortgage insurance available in the case of certain oceangoing tugs and barges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 11355. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 11356. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink,

whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 11357. A bill to provide for direct payments to the governments of certain countries which submit to the Secretary of State satisfactory proof that Palestine refugees in the Near East have been resettled in such countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 11358. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11359. A bill to provide for crediting service as an aviation midshipman for purposes of retirement for nonregular service under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, and for pay purposes under title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 11360. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate certain permittees where permits for summer or recreation-type residences on national forest lands are terminated and not renewed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11361. A bill to reclassify certain key positions and increase salaries in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11362. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 11363. A bill to provide additional dental care for dependents of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11364. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the treatment processes which shall be considered as mining for purposes of percentage depletion in the case of certain slate, and to allow taxpayers to elect to treat such processes as mining for certain past years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 11365. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 11366. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that civil service retirement annuities shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 11367. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to make widows of servicemen who die on active duty in the Armed Forces eligible for educational assistance under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 11368. A bill to provide for uniform annual observances of certain national holidays on Mondays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 11369. A bill to reclassify certain key positions and increase salaries in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 11370. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate certain permittees where permits for summer or recreation-type residences on national forest lands are terminated and not renewed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 11371. A bill to amend title 38 of the

United States Code to provide for additional compensation for veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of both kidneys; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 692. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.J. Res. 693. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 694. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.J. Res. 696. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 697. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.J. Res. 698. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.J. Res. 699. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 406. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in re the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H. Con. Res. 407. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States in the International Convention Relating to International Exhibitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H. Con. Res. 408. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress re the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 409. Concurrent resolution relating to the U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOW:

H. Res. 730. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Res. 731. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the territorial integrity of Israel be recognized, that international waterways be open to all nations and that the refugee problem in the Middle East be equitably solved; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H. Res. 732. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINN:

H. Res. 733. Resolution deploring dispatch

of American troops to the Congo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Res. 734. Resolution deploring dispatch of American troops to the Congo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

254. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to flood control on the Monongahela River, Pa.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

255. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, relative to lasting peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 11372. A bill for the relief of Paula Mapa Tonga, his wife, Tupou Naeta Tonga, and their minor daughter, Tamasita Tonga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 11373. A bill for the relief of Nazar Hayat Khan Tiwana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 11374. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11375. A bill for the relief of Ileri Semsaur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11376. A bill for the relief of Miss Franca Tolusso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11377. A bill for the relief of Angelo M. Pettito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 11378. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rajani B. Lathi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11379. A bill for the relief of Mark Bitar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11380. A bill for the relief of Ilyas Josef Al-Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 11381. A bill for the relief of E. L. Townley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 11382. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Todis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11383. A bill for the relief of Federico Campos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.J. Res. 700. Joint resolution for the relief of the Burnham Chemical Co., a Nevada corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

122. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of the Center for Human and International Relations, Geneva, N.Y., urging Congress to appropriate a respectable share of funds, commensurate with the importance and magni-

tude of the problems to be coped with, to implement the 1966 International Education Act and to support an effective long-range foreign aid program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

123. By Mr. UTT: Petition of Lester M. Andrew, Tustin, Calif., and others, relative to trade with Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

124. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to freedoms guaranteed by the first amendment of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

125. Also, petition of the Border Cities League Speech Congress, Wyandotte, Mich., relative to actions on the part of some of our elected representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

126. Also, petition of the New England Association of Fire Chiefs, Hingham, Mass., relative to support of the efforts of municipal, State, and private enterprise to combat fire problems in the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 11, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, D.D., minister, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Master of all mankind, we are grateful for these men and women of the U.S. Senate who seek Thy favor and guidance. Inspire, enlighten, and direct them in their proceedings of this day. May they know the quiet confidence that "in everything God works with those who love Him, whom He has called in accordance with His purpose, to bring about what is good."

Bless our President and his advisers. Direct the representatives of the United Nations in Middle East guidance. Give determination, intelligence, and direction to end the war in Vietnam and over the earth.

We pray in the name of Jesus, the giver of peace. Amen.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the annual report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal year 1966.

This report shows clearly the progress that is being made toward our goal of economic equality for rural America.

Farm surpluses have virtually been eliminated. With the removal of this threat to farm prices, farm income has been strengthened.

Yet the elimination of surpluses poses a new dilemma: